In Two Sections Section I

The Intercollegiate Socialist

War Collectivism and Wealth Conscription

By Harry W. Laidler

Socialists and The Problems of War

A Symposium

G. B. L. Arner
Jessie Ashley
Emily G. Balch
Wm. E. Bohn
Randolph Bourne
Arthur Bullard
Joseph D. Cannon
Evans Clark
Adolph Germer
Ellen Hayes
John Haynes Holmes
Jessie W. Hughan
Walter E. Kruesi
Algernon Lee
Charles Levermore
Walter Lippmann
W. P. Montague
Scott Nearing
Vida D. Scudder
Henry Dwight Sedgwick
A. M. Simons
John Spargo
J. G. Phelps Stokes
Alex. Trachtenberg
Wm. English Walling
Mr. and Mrs. James P. Warbasse
Chas. Zueblin

The Significance of the Russian Revolution

By Alexander Trachtenberg

Section II. Cooperation in the United States

By Cheves West Perky

April-May, 1917 Fifteen Cents

The Intercollegiate Socialist

Harry W. Laidler, Editor — **Caro Lloyd Strobell, Assistant Editor**

Published bi-monthly, except June, July, August and September

Entered as second class matter June 20, 1913, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City

10c. a copy — Subscription, 25c. a year

I. S. S. AFFILIATIONS

Adelphi	E. Tenn. Normal	Missouri	Rutgers
Albion	Grinnell	Nevada	Simpson
Amherst	Hamline	New York	South Carolina
Barnard	Harvard	North Carolina	Springfield, Y. M. C. A. Coll.
Beloit	Howard	Oberlin	Syracuse University
Berkeley Divinity	Illinois	Ohio State	Temple
Brooklyn Law	Indiana	Ohio Wesleyan	Union Theological
Carnegie Inst. Technology	Iowa St. College	Pennsylvania	Valparaiso
Chicago	John Marshall Law	Pennsylvania State	Vassar
Cincinnati	Kansas St. Agr.	Pittsburgh	Virginia
City College (N. Y.)	LaCrosse (Wis.) Normal	Princeton	Washington
Clark	Los Angeles Osteopathic	Purdue	Washington-Jefferson
Columbia	Mass. Inst. Technology	Radcliffe	Wisconsin
Cornell	Michigan	Reed	Yale
Dartmouth	Middle Tenn. Normal	Richmond	

The object of the INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY, established September 1905, is "to promote an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women." All present or former students of colleges interested in Socialism are eligible to active membership in the Society. Non-collegians are eligible to auxiliary membership. The annual dues of the Society are $2, $5 (contributing membership), $25 or more (sustaining membership.) The dues of student members-at-large are $1 a year. Undergraduate Chapters are required to pay 35c. a year per member to the General Society. All members are entitled to receive The Intercollegiate Socialist. Friends may assist in the work of the Society by becoming dues-paying members, by sending contributions, by aiding in the organization and the strengthening of undergraduate and graduate Chapters, by obtaining subscriptions for The Intercollegiate Socialist, by patronizing advertisers, and in various other ways. The Society's Quarterly is 50c. a year, 15c. a copy.

OFFICERS INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

President
J. G. PHELPS STOKES, Yale

1st Vice-President
FLORENCE KELLEY, Cornell

2nd Vice-President
ERNEST POOLE, Princeton

Treasurer
MARY R. SANFORD, Vassar

Secretary
HARRY W. LAIDLER, Wesleyan

Executive Secretary
ALICE K. BOEHME

Executive Committee

JESSIE ASHLEY,	N. Y. U. Law
LOUIS B. BOUDIN,	N. Y. U. Law
EVANS CLARK,	Amherst
W. E. B. DU BOIS,	Harvard
JESSIE W. HUGHAN,	Barnard
NICHOLAS KELLEY,	Harvard
PAUL KENNADAY,	Yale
FREDA KIRCHWEY,	Barnard
WM. P. MONTAGUE	Harvard
JOHN SPARGO	
HELEN PHELPS STOKES	
CARO LLOYD STROBELL,	Vassar
HELEN L. SUMNER,	Wellesley
WM. ENGLISH WALLING,	Chicago
CHAS. ZUEBLIN,	Chicago

Alumni Chapters

Berkeley
Boston
Buffalo
Chicago
Cleveland
Columbus
Detroit
Los Angeles
New York
Pittsburgh
Portland, Ore.
St. Louis
Schenectady
Seattle
Springfield
Washington
Wilkes-Barre

SECTIONAL COMMITTEE

New England	*Middle West*	*Far West*	*Southern Atlantic*
HELENA S. DUDLEY	GEORGE H. BISHOP	ERNEST F. BATES	WM. F. COCHRAN
VIDA D. SCUDDER	MAX SENIOR	JOHN R. HAYNES	MARY RAOUL MILLIS

STUDENT COUNCIL

DEVERE ALLEN, Oberlin
CLARA ELIOT, Reed
MADELINE HUNT, Vassar
G. E. CUNNINGHAM, Beloit
A. EPSTEIN, Pittsburg
HARRY L. JANEWAY, Rutgers
BROADUS MITCHELL, Johns Hopkins
ROBERT W. DUNN, Yale
AMMON A. HENNACY, Ohio State
HILMAR RAUSCHENBUSCH, Amherst
A. RICKLES, Washington

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST

VOL. V APRIL-MAY, 1917 No. 4

The Third Summer Conference

The third summer conference of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society will be held September next at Bellport, Long Island. This charming old village lies on the South Shore of the Island, half-way between New York and Montauk Point. It nestles cosily in the shelter of Great South Bay, a sheet of water thirty miles long separated from the ocean by a narrow arm of land. Here Goldthwaite Inn has been kindly placed at our disposal by its owners, Mr. and Mrs. Darwin J. Meserole. Standing twenty feet above the water, its back to the village, the stores, the railroad and all the machinery of life, the Inn faces a lovely view of bay and shore and catches the sea-cooled south wind on its porches. Another building near by, once a beautiful country home, has now been annexed to the Inn. It is called the Lloyd in memory of the late Henry Demarest Lloyd. Its large living room which, supplemented by the wide piazza, will accommodate an audience of at least two hundred, will, it is hoped, shelter many conferences of workers for social betterment, and notably this of the I. S. S. The time of the conference will be from Tuesday evening, September 18, to Monday, September 24, 1917. The program has not as yet been formulated, but will undoubtedly include a discussion of the problem of the socialization of industry and certain important international questions. It is expected that the list of speakers will maintain the high standard set by the two previous conventions.

As many members as can arrange to make their vacations coincide with the conference will find Bellport a delightful playing-ground. As last year, the afternoons will be left free for informal conferences, for rest and recreation. Suffolk county, in which Bellport is situated, enjoys the reputation of being the most healthful county in the United States, Berkshire, Mass., being second. There will be opportunity for fishing and bathing in the bay, and for those who prefer surf-bathing, sail boats leave the Goldthwaite dock for the run of three miles to the ocean. There are tennis courts, and alluring objectives for auto trips, such as Shinnecock Hills and the famous National Golf Links, or, for the less strenuous idealists, there are quiet walks over fields and woods and lazy afternoons on the sand dunes following the lure of the far horizon.

It is hoped that a large number of members will not only attend themselves, but will tell their sympathetic friends of this opportunity. The two conferences already held have proved sources of true inspiration and enriched fellowship, and that of 1917 should prove even more stimulating. Grave problems, new and confusing issues are crowding upon us and calling all earnest students of Socialism to bestir themselves. In a few days at such a gathering where radicals of all persuasions meet in holiday mood and confer informally on great international crises, it is often possible to get more help and comradeship than in a month of winter meetings.

Circulars containing full information are later to be sent to the members.

Book on Public Ownership

The Society is happy to announce that Holt & Co. have just accepted for early publication "State Socialism—Pro and Con," —a volume edited by Wm. English Walling and other members of a Committee of the I. S. S. This promises to be the most complete source book on public ownership and control in various countries ever compiled and will prove invaluable to all students of social problems. It will be ready in the early summer and can be purchased from the I. S. S. office (price, probably, $2.00.)

War Collectivism and Wealth Conscription

By Harry W. Laidler

One of the results of the European war has been the sweep toward State Socialism. The English government has, since the beginning of the war, taken charge of its railroads; monopolized its sugar and its wheat crop from India; obtained control of its coal mines; gone extensively into state insurance; appropriated millions of dollars for the erection of houses; appointed a dictator of food products.

Many months ago the German government—which, prior to the war, had advanced furthest in collectivism—was said to employ no less than 55% of its industrial population in state industry. It has organized its food supplies on a more comprehensive scale than any other nation. Its marvelous military endurance may largely be attributed to this governmental regimentation of its economic resources. Even such non-belligerent countries as Denmark have been plunged headlong into collectivism. So extensive, indeed, has been this wave that H. G. Wells has been led to prophesy that "out of the ruins of the twentieth century system of capitalism that this war has smashed forever there will arise the framework of a new economic and social order based on national ownership and national service."

Many are the forces which have led to this war-collectivism. The withdrawal of millions of men from their ordinary industrial pursuits; the feeding and clothing of masses of soldiers in distant parts; the destruction of vast quantities of commodities in battle; the bitter struggle for supremacy between the nations—all have made it necessary to husband resources in the most scientific manner. And war collectivism was found to supply this and other needs. Public control made it possible to mobilize speedily all these resources for military purposes. It prevented the exaction of exorbitant prices by private monopoly. It eliminated many wastes, regulated consumption, so that a given quantity would go farther.

It is too early to forecast its ultimate effect. Part of it will undoubtedly return to private ownership; part will remain public. The endeavor to obtain revenue for payment of war debts will, doubtless, lead to the acquisition of still other industries. Sidney Webb's advice in "How to Pay for the War" will receive earnest consideration.*

What has happened abroad will, in part, be repeated in this country. Already big business has become alarmed and has urged men of wealth to see to it that, should any industry be temporarily socialized during war time, no impediment be put in the way of a return to private ownership after peace is declared. The alacrity with which many private firms have assured the government that they will not exact exorbitant profits in case war is declared, is another indication of this fear.

We hear the head of the Chicago Chamber of Commerce demanding the federal control of railroads; the con-

---

*The copper trust attained considerable advertisement by announcing that it would supply the government with 45,000,000 pounds of copper at half the market price. On the following day the Wall Street reporter for the *Chicago Tribune* (Mark Watson) pointed out that 45,000,000 pounds of copper is less than two per cent of the total output, so that an imperceptible raise of prices on the product sold to private concerns would more than repay what was granted to the government.

The national government has already—in a somewhat halting and inadequate fashion—begun a campaign against exorbitant war profits. In Section 3 of the last naval appropriation bill, the President is authorized to require those who supply certain materials to the government for the navy to place the output of the factories at the disposal of the United States and to deliver such output "at such reasonable price as may be determined by the President." A section of the national defence act makes it a felony to fail to meet the government's demands; another section authorizes the taking over and operation of all or any part of any plant.

A Washington dispatch of April 6 states that the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance compelled E. W. Bliss Company to reduce their price $1,500 on each torpedo sold to the government over their former price, a saving of over $2,000,000 on one order. Steel, copper, zinc and lead producers have also been induced or forced to cut their prices very materially.

servative governor of the Empire State tentatively suggesting a controller of food supplies, and John J. Dillon, Commissioner of Foods and Markets of New York City, agitating for a comprehensive system of public markets and public control of food.

Report also has it that President Wilson has approved a bill for the government control and operation of all railroad, telephone and telegraph lines in the United States.

What should be the attitude of the believer in industrial democracy toward such war-collectivism? Should he advance or oppose it?

State ownership, though not thoroughly democratic, has certain advantages, especially in politically advanced countries. It proves the Socialist contention that a vast number of wastes may be eliminated, and that industry may be run without private profit and enormous salaries. It gives the producers an added incentive to democratize the political and industrial functions of their government, takes away from the state the corrupting pressure of huge private interests, tends to emphasize the industrial rather than the police activities of government, and provides an incentive for further socialization. When the number of government bondholders is increased, and the number of private stockholders decreased, as a result of the transfer of property from private to public hands, the government finds itself in a strategic position to apply large graduated income and inheritance taxes without possibility of evasion.

Furthermore, if the socialization is of the proper kind, it indirectly proves a powerful weapon against war. For war will cease to be hailed by industrial and financial war lords just as soon as they learn that it is going to be used by the masses to take away special privilege by socializing industry.

On the other hand, if such collectivism is left to those without a social vision, efforts will probably be made (1) to induce the government to pay exorbitant prices for property transferred; (2) to raise the money for such purposes wholly through the issuance of bonds rather than through the imposition of graduated income, inheritance and land values taxes; (3) to conduct industry in total disregard of trade union rules and the rights of the workers; (4) to give control into the hands of those who have little interest in running public industry efficiently and democratically, and who are anxious that such industry be returned to private hands after the war crisis is over and at terms, perhaps, none too favorable to public interest. Should this kind of war collectivism be permanent, efforts would probably be made to make its prime purpose the raising of revenue rather than the improvement of the service, the decrease of prices and the bettering of the condition of the worker. The movement would probably be halting, illogical and narrow.

Should such a movement then be left to those possessing the "capitalist psychology," or should not the believer in industrial democracy endeavor to direct this collectivist wave? Personally, I believe that he should. In the cities, state and nation he should endeavor to see that it receives the ardent support of the Socialist and labor movement, so that its achievement may inspire these forces with the sense of victory and so that its direction may be altogether democratic. He should plan for the socialization of industry; for the raising of money through definite forms of taxation; and for an organization of industry that might combine democracy with efficiency. He should be a vigorous critic, and in every way help to make war-collectivism a foundation stone for an enduring cooperative commonwealth. A concerted demand for the public ownership of the railroads, telegraphs and telephones, coal mines, insurance, banking, armament, food and other industries should be begun without delay.

Conscription of Wealth

War-collectivism may be viewed as one method of conscripting wealth. Other methods should be used. The burden of financing the war should be placed on those best able to stand it—

through heavily graduated income inheritance and other taxes. Such taxes —like war collectivism—would compel the chief gainers from war to feel some of its disadvantages; would relieve present and future generations from the burden of enormous debts; would make special privilege more cautious in its advocacy of war and more ready to favor peace proposals; and would lead to the establishment of certain precedents that might, in the future, help materially in a juster distribution of wealth.

"The burden of war," declared Owen R. Lovejoy, Amos Pinchot and John L. Elliott, of the American Committee on War Finance, "must be borne by those who are financially strong and are able to give. Above all, the war must be paid for as it proceeds. There must be no crushing legacy of bonded debt to be paid in taxes by the men who have done the fighting and their children. Let us make this a cash war, a pay-as-you-enter war. In our Civil War, a million men volunteered at Lincoln's call during the first year. But the nation's private fortunes did not volunteer. They declared for patriotism, while they profited on the country's necessity. A congressional committee disclosed $17,000,000 of graft in contracts for less than $50,000,000. The public need not be reminded of the experiences during the Spanish-American war."

The Committee therefore urges all citizens to demand the enactment of the following legislation:

1. That, in case of war, all net incomes of $5,000 or over shall be subject to the following annual graduated war contributions:

On all net incomes from $5,000 to $10,000 a contribution of 2½%.

On all incomes over $10,000 a year a contribution increasing on a sliding scale, beginning at 10%, and rising to a point which will permit of no individual retaining an annual net income in excess of $100,000 during the war.

2. That no war supplies or war service, including transportation, shall be furnished to the government at a net profit of more than 3½%.

3. That no wholesale or retail dealer shall sell food or other basic necessities of life during the war at a profit larger than 6%.

4. That intentional failure to supply the government with correct figures as to incomes and profits on such sales and service shall be a felony, punishable by imprisonment.

5. That any individual or corporation who knowingly furnishes the government with defective war supplies, shall be guilty of a felony, punishable by imprisonment.

The Wisconsin Senate on March 29 took a stand for taxation of an even more drastic character than that proposed by the Committee on War Finance, and also went on record in favor of the socialization of industry. The resolution reads in part as follows:

Resolved, By the Senate, the House concurring, that the following measures be presented to the senators and representatives of this state in the national congress, for their favorable consideration:

1. Immediate conscription by the government of all annual incomes in excess of $10,000 to defray the expenses of war.

2. Immediate conscription by the government of all railroads and their operation by the present administrative officers under a Cabinet department without profit; stockholders to be compensated pro rata on the basis of the physical valuation of the railroads, said compensation to be paid when the physical valuation of the railroads is completed.

3. Immediate conscription by the government of all natural resources including mines and oil wells, and their operation under the Bureau of Mines without profit.

4. Immediate conscription by the government of all food storage warehouses; their operation for the public good; and the passage of a law making the speculation in food supplies an act of treason under the articles of war.

5. The government shall deal with the workers in all industries so conscripted through their own organizations; sufficient safeguards being given the right of unorganized workers to organize.

The act of the North Dakota legislature was of a similar import.

There is surely room for an increase of our present income tax, which is graded from 1% on incomes of from $3,000 ($4,000 for married men) to $20,000, to 7% on incomes of over $500,000. Prior to the war, the income taxes of both Germany and England were heavier than those in this country. In May, 1914, the Great Britain rates, ranged from 7% for an income of $20,000 to 13% for one of $500,000, while in Germany incomes over $250,000 "were forced to pay from 16% to 32% plus a heavy graduated tax on all increase in property values."*

Nor can we consider the recommendations of the American Committee on War Finance particularly drastic if we compare them even with those of Great Britain, following the declaration of

---

*Walling, *New Income and Inheritance Taxes for the United States.* (I. S. S. Publication, 10c.)

war. There the $4,000 income now pays $500, or one-eighth to the government; the unearned income, one-fifth; over $10,000, 25% of all moneys received other than for labor, and 25% likewise on all income above $12,500, earned or unearned.

In addition to this, there is a gradually increasing surtax for incomes above $15,000. The high water mark is 41½% paid when incomes reach $500,000 a year; or a tax of $203,000. Sidney Webb advocates securing 75% of all incomes over $50,000, while J. Ramsay McDonald desires that all income more than $25,000 be taken over.

The inheritance tax now collected by the various states is insignificant compared with such recommendation as that in the Minority Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations that the nation exact no less than 100% tax on all estates of more than $1,000,000! Less radical recommendations—yet of a more advanced nature than the present system—are those of Professor John Commons, who suggested a maximum of 15% and of Professor Alvin Johnson in the Atlantic Monthly (January, 1915), average of 5% on the tax on legacies below $50,000, to 15% on the average on those above.

A properly applied land values tax would also yield a very considerable income.

Is it not time to circulate thousands of petitions demanding socialization and wealth conscription and to see that Congress and the President are made cognizant of the real feelings of the people on this vital question?

Nor should workers cease for one moment their agitation for free speech, free press, freedom of association, for the maintenance of ante-war labor standard, and for the highest American ideals of liberty.

Socialists and The Problems of War

A Symposium

A few weeks ago, in order to give to the readers of *The Intercollegiate Socialist* the results of the serious thought of a number of prominent Socialists and publicists in this country on the question of war and peace, the editors submitted a number of questions. Twenty-seven responded. The questions and their answers are given below. Every shade of opinion, as will be seen, is here represented. We believe that they will be immensely stimulating. We regret that a number whose answers were sought on account of the representative character of their position, were, on account of other work, unable to respond. However, the opinion of all of these has undoubtedly been expressed, in considerable part, in one or more of the replies. All of these answers were made prior to the war declaration. We wish here to take occasion to express our appreciation of the prompt and able responses of the brilliant group of contributors.

QUESTIONNAIRE

(1) Do you believe that Socialists and other socially minded groups should oppose entrance into every international war? If so, why? If not, under what circumstances would you think it justifiable for them to enter? What substitutes for war should Socialists advocate?

(2) Do you believe that, after the declaration of war, Socialists and others should continue their opposition? If so, under what circumstances and in what manner? If not, why not?

(3) Do you believe in an advisory war referendum? If so, why, and under what conditions? If not, why not?

(4) What, in your opinion, should be the attitude of Socialists on conscription and why?

(5) On what constructive measures do you believe that Socialists should concentrate during war time?

(6) Remarks.

Is War Ever Justified?

In answer to question 1, twelve declare their opposition to all international wars, either on the ground that they are futile or neutralize the class struggle, or injure the workers and social progress, or encourage militarism. An uncompromising attitude toward war, says one, is the only way to abolish it.

Others think that radicals should support war if a country is actually invaded or if a group of nations, the majority of which are democratic, are fighting for the preservation of international law or in behalf of democracy. A further special case of justifiable warfare mentioned is one which would indirectly assist in the abolition of capitalism or aid in the success of a social revolution.

Many substitutes are proposed. They include economic justice and the establishment of Socialism at home; such international machinery as an international arbitration tribunal, a world court, a joint high commission, a league to enforce peace, education as to what constitutes patriotism, international agreement for disarmament, democratic control of foreign policies, economic boycotts, free trade, internationalization of seas and straits, and open doors in colonies.

Should War Opposition Be Continued?

The majority of those opposing all international war, agree that opposition should not cease after war is declared. Some believe that agitation should be confined merely to a fight against arbitrary acts, against military rule at home and that efforts should be directed to an early peace. Others think that congressional representatives should be urged to refuse to vote appropriations, and others still, that the example of the conscientious objector in England should be followed in refusing to enlist in military service. A minority of this group feel, however, that after entrance, all opposition should be suspended except that necessitated by Socialist principle or personal conviction. One of these believed that Pacifists should begin the work of alleviating suffering and of preparing for reconciliation after peace is declared.

Those favoring war under certain circumstances, declare, for the most part, that opposition following war declarations depends on whether or not the particular war is justifiable. The majority hold that in case the continuance of the war would assist the forces of reaction, such continuance should be opposed. The exact character of the opposition should be based on the strength of the anti-militarist sentiment. General strikes might be desirable in certain instances and foolhardy in others.

The Referendum

Great diversity of opinion exists on the war referendum. All, save two, who do not believe in the wisdom of the majority, accept it as a democratic ideal. About half hesitate because the people are not free to form an intelligent opinion, whether from lack of education, or the jingo press, or secret diplomacy, etc. Several believe that there is not sufficient time for it in a war crisis, though one advocate states that it could be done through the post-office in less than a month, and another names as an advantage that it would give time for passions to cool. Six unqualifiedly endorse the idea.

Conscription

Six writers favor conscription, two are undecided, fifteen are opposed. Five favor universal military training, giving among other reasons that it is the only fair and democratic method, that it would prevent the forming of a military master class, and might even make the working class invincible. One writer would, however, exempt conscientious objectors.

Of those opposing, the majority do so on the ground that it menaces the liberty of individuals and of society. Another group of six believe that it would be disastrous to the working class for various reasons, would compel them to make sacrifices for militaristic wars, would be useless to them as a revolutionary tool, would be used by employers against them in settling disputes, would undermine their militant democratic spirit and place the industrial world on a military model. That it would bring with it the danger of race wars and would be a continual temptation to militaristic expansion are other views. One writer favors resisting even non-combatant service, while another holds that even the mildest form of conscription law should be opposed, but, when once the law is enacted, to resist would not embarrass the military forces, but would bring all the energies of the Socialist organization to a standstill. Two propose as a substitute compulsory social service.

Constructive Measures

The majority feel that they should strive (1) for socialization of industry, for conscription of wealth to pay war expenditures and for the elimination of war profits; (2) for the maintenance of free speech, free press and labor standards and the strengthening of the working class; and (3) for measures which would lead to peace.

Some specifically declare that Socialists should continue to emphasize the international point of view, while one favors their encouraging acts tending to show that Socialists are not anti-nationalists. One maintains that Socialists should do all in their power to bring victory to the democratic side; two others, that the best constructive work was that of opposing war and of organizing the opponents of war. While many believe that socialization of industry should be in every way encouraged, at least one points out the danger that "unless proletarian industries, present and future, are vigilantly and energetically protected at every point", the cause of the workers might be weakened rather than strengthened.

ANSWERS

G. B. L. Arner

1. My own attitude toward war is that of unqualified opposition under all circumstances. While this seems to me to be the logical position of all who sympathize with the producers as against the exploiters, there may be from a practical point of view a limit beyond which active opposition is not only futile but dangerous to the Socialist movement itself. Actual invasion, as France was invaded in 1914, will always meet armed resistance regardless of theories. Passive resistance, the only alternative to defensive war, presupposes a perfection of spiritual unity and a sublimity of moral courage which can never be developed under capitalism. The only way in which war can be made impossible is through the realization of the ideal of international Socialism. Until then, wars must be prevented as duels are prevented: by avoiding provocation, by ignoring petty insults and by submitting serious controversies to an impartial tribunal with power to enforce its judgments.

2. In the event of actual war, active anti-war agitation should be suspended and only resumed when it becomes possible by agitation to hasten the return of peace. Radical groups opposed to war should conserve their energies and retain their public influence as far as is possible without the sacrifice of principle, so that after the crisis is past and a measure of social sanity is restored, they may be able to take a part in the work of reconstruction. No international Socialist, however, can consistently bear arms in a war between capitalist nations.

3. I favor the advisory war referendum on general principles, but I have little confidence in its practical value.

4. Socialists should oppose conscription under all circumstances. Universal military service would benefit only the capitalist class, and the existence of an effective military force would be a constant temptation to indulge in imperialistic expansion and commercial wars. Military training would never be of advantage to the proletariat in a revolution against the capitalist social order. Only an overwhelming majority could ever wrest military power from the capitalist class by force, and a unified proletariat strong enough to win by violence could more easily win by means of a general strike.

5. In time of war the greatest emphasis in Socialist activity should be directed to the central economic demand of the party program; the socialization of the principal means of production, transportation and exchange. On this proposal war makes the Socialist position unanswerable. G. B. L. Arner.

Jessie Ashley

1. Yes. The aim of social endeavor should be co-operation, which is inconsistent with war.

2. Yes. Passive resistance.

3. No. War should not be even suggested as a social means of progress.

4. Resistance to the uttermost. Conscription means force. We should stand for free action.

5. Efforts to keep all "revolutionary" groups together in an effort to encourage freedom of speech and action, and to show as far as possible the truth behind the lies given out and to assist all efforts toward peace. But if the above ideas were carried out, it is unlikely there would be many Socialists left at large to do anything constructive or otherwise.

6. Remarks.

I believe Socialists should concentrate on industrial evolution and revolution and help each other, not kill each other.

Jessie Ashley.

Emily G. Balch

1. Yes. Moral and economic futility of war. (Substitutes): In the present crisis a joint high commission. In general, judicial and legal methods.

2. Yes. By legal methods unless one's conscience requires martyrdom.

3. Yes. Before the country is directly or indirectly committed to war.

4. Opposition in every possible way. It means conscription of mind, hierarchical stratification of society, industrial discipline on military model, obedience as the prime virtue.

5. Wait till war comes. It won't come if the people *who don't want it* will say so. Emily Green Balch.

Wm. E. Bohn

1. Yes. I think Socialists should oppose all international wars at the present time. All such wars are carried on for capitalist purposes and the working class can have nothing to gain from them. All social effort toward betterment is hindered by war.

2. Yes. After beginning of war opposition is more important than before. I think we should refuse to vote appropriations, should refuse to enlist or be conscripted, should do our best to make people understand the causes and results of war in order that they may be led to withdraw support.

3. I am not enthusiastic about pushing the referendum idea in connection with war. I think it best to make the campaign directly against war.

4. Absolutely opposed. Conscription robs the individual of freedom. Society loses the good which comes from the exercise of the individual judgment.

5. Socialists should concentrate during war time on, (1) organization of opponents of war to the end that opposition may be effective, (2) effort to preserve rights of working class.

6. The principle underlying all this is that for the Socialist war is merely a continuation of what we call "peace." There is a change of forms, of means, but no change of principle. So the attitude of the Socialist should be exactly the same before, during and after the war.

WM. E. BOHN.

Randolph Bourne

1. Yes. Socialists should oppose entrance into every international war. Should advocate councils of inquiry, joint commissions for unorganized territories, internationalization of seas and straits; open door in colonies.

2. They should continue opposition to all arbitrary acts of the government, all military rule at home; also agitate for earliest possible peace.

3. I believe in an advisory referendum for any proposed hostile action short of defense against actual invasion.

4. Against conscription, because it is the readiest tool of the military class and the negation of all civil liberty.

5. Socialists should throw their influence during war time towards insuring that the centralization and integration of the nation that takes place should proceed along socialistic lines that can be easily made democratic when the war is over. War should be made a preparation for peace.

RANDOLPH BOURNE.

Arthur Bullard

1. No. Unless one is a believer in passive resistance. All revolutionists are prepared to resort to violence to install the Revolution. They should, I believe, be equally ready to fight in defense of the gains the Revolution has already made.

2. It depends on *what* war. Socialists should continue their opposition to anti-revolutionary forces in war just as in peace. The issues are rarely, if ever, clear cut in mass movements. Some progress and some reaction are present on both sides in any war. If the Socialists believe that the preponderating influences in a given war are progressive and liberal they should support it as long as these progressive elements predominate. They should oppose any war in its inception or in its later developments if it seems to them to be preponderatingly working towards reaction. Whether they are opposing or supporting anything they should do it whole heartedly with all the means at their disposal.

3. In exactly the same sense in which I believe in collective ownership of the means of production and distribution. I believe that before either is practically possible a large amount of popular education is necessary. And it is the principal business of organized Socialists to supply that education. A referendum on war, just like the municipalization of rapid transit in a big city would probably defeat its purpose if attempted suddenly without adequate preparation. The possibility of such pure democracy is the goal toward which we, Socialists, are driving.

Napoleon III's Referendums demonstrated how much depends on how the question is phrased, how easy it is to falsify the public wish.

4. If it is agreed that a large permanent army is needed Socialists should

demand universal service. A democratic distribution of force is just as desirable as a democratic distribution of wealth. Under the Swiss system every citizen takes his equipment home with him. Reactionaries have said that this system is impractical here. "No nation," they say, "where there is so much social discontent could dare to let every one have weapons." The obvious Socialist retort is: "No nation where every citizen was armed could risk having so much social discontent."

If we are to have a large permanent army we must have conscription. It is the only democratic method.

But if the League to Enforce Peace is established, if President Wilson's ideal prevails, there will be disarmament. It would be unfortunate for us to establish a permanent conscription system on the pretext of a temporary emergency.

5. Education. I see no reason why Socialist plans should be changed by war. The method used to realize these plans will be altered, but the goal—getting a working majority of the people to understand their situation—will be the same.

6. Remarks: Although the present crisis which faces us is not mentioned in your questionnaire it is implied throughout. I think the Socialists in America are confronted with a problem very similar to that faced by our European comrades. The question before us is not: shall we take part in this war—but: which side shall we help?

Some of the old Greek Republics had laws requiring all citizens to take sides in civil wars. Neutrality was not tolerated. The world has grown so small in these modern days that the distinction between civil and foreign wars is largely lost. True neutrality is no longer possible. The German comrades would have voted overwhelmingly against war in the abstract. But they had to vote on whether to help Germany or Russia. The French anti-militarists were not afraid to die for their convictions, but they did not want to die for Russia. However high the motives of anti-war strikes or insurrection might have been, the practical result would have helped the enemy. The French and German Socialists could not be neutral.

No more can we. The United States cannot avoid influencing the war in Europe. We cannot be aloof. We must help one side or the other. American Socialists must decide which group of belligerents is the more liberal and progressive and support war on their side.

I, personally, favor the Entente and our entrance into the war on their side.

ARTHUR BULLARD.

Joseph D. Cannon

1. Not absolutely. The Belgian or French Socialists could not very well have refrained from entering or ceasing their opposition to entrance to the European war. They had no choice. The war was carried to them and as a matter of self-preservation they had to endeavor to protect themselves. In the United States it is different for the reason that such an invasion is impossible, as is almost any kind of an invasion, and most of all, one from Europe, Asia or South America. Invasions might come, if we give our imaginations sufficient play, from Mexico or Canada, but these would be more in the nature of musical comedy than real war. However, if they do come, I nominate De Wolf Hopper for Commander in Chief of the repelling forces.

As a substitute for war, I offer a complete cessation of all relations with an offending nation, not only diplomatic, but commercial as well. For instance, Germany is the offender at the present time, although it is hard to define the difference between her offenses to us and ours to her since we have decided to arm vessels to carry munitions of war to her enemies. When it is decided that Germany must be punished for her interference with our commerce and for the lives of our citizens she has sacrificed, let us notify Germany that her ships cannot enter our ports, that our ships will not go to hers, and that neutral nations must pledge themselves not to send goods, brought from the United States, to Germany. Tell her that as soon as it is safe for her to do so, she must take her ships and those of her people, which are interned here for safety, away in ballast, and that with her we will have no dealings or trade of any nature until she

shall have made reparation in full for all damages inflicted upon us and given satisfaction for every wrong committed against the United States and its people. This would be a more severe punishment to Germany and Germany's commercial interests than warring upon her, present or future. Germany counts upon her commerce after the war for quick rehabilitation. Deny her this and she will realize the hopelessness of quick post-bellum revival. But this method would not be profitable to our business or banking interests, therefore it is not popular in either press or pulpit.

2. It is ever patriotic to oppose an unjust or an unnecessary war, and it is ever blessed to work for peace, the joy of murder to the contrary notwithstanding. In their opposition to war Socialists or others should be careful not to do anything that might be a help to the enemies who might endeavor to bring war here. Sight of the fact should not be lost, that it is war to which they are opposed, not the nation of their birth or adoption. Oppose war in every manner possible that might be effective, but a resort to methods which might be considered treasonable would be far from effective in stopping war. In fact the effect would be the opposite.

3. Yes. The people who must make the sacrifices and pay the bills should have the power to decide the issue. Indeed last November the people thought they were voting practically on a war referendum when voting for Wilson. But one would think in looking over the situation now that they had voted for Wilson to get us into the war.

4. Anyone and everyone who has any idea of attaining new liberties or preserving old ones should oppose conscription. War, in itself, might be bearable, but conscription, never. Conscription means the end of liberty, until war, international or civil, kills conscription. I can conceive of a truce with war, but never with conscription. We might justify war, to save us from militarism, but rationality can never conceive of militarism to save us from war. It makes it, forces it inevitably, and that is the purpose of those advocating it no matter what hypocrisy or fine phrases they may use to mask their propaganda.

5. The most constructive measure on which Socialists should concentrate their efforts is Socialism. True it is necessary to fight to keep out of the war, but, while doing that, we should begin on the construction of the co-operative commonwealth. The signs point strongly now to the social revolution in Europe at or before the end of the present war. Capitalism has reached the breaking point. Junkerism seems doomed. To save the credits of the Allies the United States is being forced into the war. But with the refusal of European peoples to continue their present governments or systems of production, the crash is coming. Capitalism wants to save the world to capitalism, but forcing our entrance will probably have a far different result. With the complete breaking down of governments and industry in Europe the United States, at war, will be caught in the vortex. With the stability of the world gone this nation, at war, cannot retain stability at home, and we will find ourselves in the crash and, sorry to say, the workers and mostly the Socialists are less prepared for it here than anywhere else. In other countries they have their co-operatives. Here we have practically none.

With the co-operatives we could provide ourselves with food and other necessities during the crisis, and they would serve as a foundation on which we could construct the new order. These would be the great constructive element while all else would be destructive. Therefore, the most constructive measures for Socialists right now would be the establishment of co-operative stores, retail, at first, then wholesale as they were required, then factories, and from the beginning deal directly with the farmers. They are ready, in fact, many of them already launched in this move.

The best way to get Socialism is to begin getting it ourselves instead of asking capitalism to get it for us.

JOSEPH D. CANNON.

Evans Clark

1. Socialists should oppose entrance into every international war except in some cases of actual territorial invasion.

(1) Because the present war has proven that it is utterly impossible in practice for Socialists and others to distinguish between an "offensive" and a "defensive" war, and (2) because all wars and preparations for war are the arch-enemies of every kind of freedom, because they invariably increase the power of the property-owning class and break down the independence of the workers, because the sum total of human agony that war brings must always outweigh any conceivable human gain except existence itself, and, finally, because the national hate which is the invariable concomitant of war for all those who partake in it multiplies the impossibilities of human understanding and therefore of an ultimate international community of law and order.

Socialists should advocate one substitute in particular—an international government. We are living in the frontier days of world civilization. In frontier communities the anarchy of individual self-help must always give way before the law and order of organized government. We can never have a world civilization until we have a world government.

This should include: (1) a bicameral legislature, the senate to give equal representation to every nation, the house to give representation on a population basis; (2) an international executive committee chosen by the legislature; and (3) an international judiciary.

This government should have the following powers: (1) To pass all laws relating to the relations between nations; (2) to organize and maintain an international army and navy police force; (3) to decide all disputes arising between nations under international law; (4) to enforce these decisions with the international police force; (5) to eliminate all purely national military establishment except those necessary for domestic police duty; and (6) to appoint commissions to investigate and report on conflicting national claims in undeveloped territories as the basis for further legislation.

2. Yes. Only in the following ways: (1) By the acts of their representatives in the legislature—voting against war credits, opposing all measures calculated to lengthen war or abridge the liberties of the people; (2) by agitation, opposing all such limitations of freedom; and (3) by every method bringing forward early, definite and constructive peace proposals.

3. No. Because (1) in time of acute national feeling that always accompanies a national crisis and under the pressure of a jingo press the vote would probably be for war, and (2) the mechanical difficulties are insuperable, i. e., (a) circumstances change too rapidly to allow the canvass of 15,000,000 votes in time to meet any given international situation and (b) war depends almost wholly on previous negotiations which are not dependent on a referendum and cannot possibly be.

NOTE—I would have Socialists urge complete congressional control of the conduct of foreign policy.

4. Unqualified opposition (to conscription) in peace or war.

Because (1) it destroys or makes it possible to destroy the strength and independence of organized labor by giving over industrial power to military control; (2) it stamps out, by making every man liable to military order, all possibility of freedom of speech or action by men in war time; (3) it robs men of the most sacred right to make for themselves the momentous personal decision of a lifetime; (4) its educational effect is the very antithesis of every modern liberal ideal: for the private, the annihilation of freedom, independence and self-determination; for the officer, the development of every characteristic of the autocrat and the despot which has made these words odious, and (5) because it makes for servility, unquestioning obedience, blind respect for authority, and for every quality among the workers which the propertied classes are pleased to call "the industrial virtues," thus undermining that militant, democratic freedom of their spirit which is the only hope of progress.

5. The following constructive measures especially: (1) The earliest, most definite and most enlightened peace proposals; (2) the maintenance of freedom of speech and of the press; (3) the elimination of all profits from the manufacture of every article for war use; (4) the conscription of wealth to meet the cost of

war; (5) the maintenance of union wages and working conditions in all war shops; (6) equal pay for equal work regardless of sex in all plants, and (7) the immediate federalization for war purposes, but in perpetuity, of the railroads, mines, shipyards, steamships and ammunition plants.

EVANS CLARK.

Adolph Germer

1. I believe that the Socialists and other socially minded groups should oppose entrance into every international war, except in the event that this or any other country should establish a social democracy and it would be attacked by other nations. To illustrate what I mean, let us suppose that we socialized all industry to carry on wealth production for use instead of for profit. Should any nation endeavor to invade this country and destroy this form of industrial society, I should not only favor, but urge that we resist such invasion. I am unqualifiedly opposed to an international war that grows out of commercial rivalry. As a substitute for war, as long as capitalism endures, I would advocate an international arbitration tribunal, whose awards could be enforced when necessary by an international boycott.

2. Yes, I do believe that Socialists, even after war is declared, should continue their opposition. The fact that it is declared does not make war any holier or more righteous. If we are justified, and I feel that we are, in opposing the idea of war before its declaration, I feel that we are equally justified in continuing our propaganda against war after it has been declared.

3. I do believe in an advisory war referendum, but contend that it shall be attended by a free and unrestricted discussion of facts. I favor an advisory referendum under all conditions. To those who might ask whether I would favor it in case of an invasion, I would say yes, because an invasion would not take place over night. An invasion is the result of conditions that develop gradually, allowing sufficient time to get an expression from the people.

4. The Socialists should stubbornly oppose conscription. This, for the reason that all wars in the past have been the result of commercial rivalry and those who had most to fight for did not fight. Conscription would compel one to fight to protect the interests of our industrial pirates, while they themselves remained at home and reaped the harvest. We should oppose everything that smacks of militarism, but if the Jingos triumph, then I favor that each one subject to military duty be permitted to keep his rifle in his home and be supplied by the government by at least 1,000 rounds of ammunition.

5. During times of war the Socialists should concentrate their efforts on immediately socializing all of the industries that have any direct or indirect connection with war.

ADOLPH GERMER.

Ellen Hayes

1. It depends upon the cause and nature of the war, e. g., I believe that Socialists along with all other socially minded groups of the neutral nations should have urged their governments, in the Fall of 1914, to break off diplomatic and economic relations with the Central Powers of Europe, and to that extent, at least, enter war against Germany and Austria. I believe that the ultimate substitute for war must be such an education for everybody as shall result in the elimination of the superstition of patriotism. Therefore, Socialists should make it part of their business to promote this education.

2. Again it depends upon the war, e. g., if the United States had declared war on Mexico at any time during the past five years, I believe that Socialists should have persisted in their opposition to it. I do not believe that Socialists should continue their opposition if war is presently declared against Germany.

3. Yes, I believe in an advisory war referendum, as a special case of referendums in general because (a) it is a means of education in democracy for the people and (b) it is the only way that the "powers that be" can know the mind of the people as regards entrance into war.

4. Until a better way than war is found for settling such troubles as now result in war, conscription, under some circumstances, may be necessary. Thus if an invasion cannot be repelled by a volunteer army, resort should be had to conscription. ELLEN HAYES.

John Haynes Holmes

1. Yes. Socialists and other socially-minded groups should oppose entrance into every international war. We have only to recall that all European belligerents are now fighting defensively, according to their own statements, to understand that there can be no exceptions in this war business. War, like every other social evil, will be done away with only when men fight it uncompromisingly.

2. No. After war has come, organized opposition should cease at once. Having failed of its purpose, it should at once take the new form of organized work for the alleviation of the misery attendant upon war, the softening and removing of the enmities aroused by war, and, above all, for preparation for the inevitable reconciliation which must come about when hostilities have ceased. Of course such cessation of opposition does not mean that individuals should necessarily become soldiers. This question must be settled by each individual for himself as a matter of conscience.

3. Yes. I believe in a war referendum. I have been told that in this country a referendum could be taken in less than a month through the medium of the post office.

4. Socialists and similar groups should oppose conscription under all circumstances. Conscription has no place in a democracy.

5. This question has been answered under No. 2.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Jessie W. Hughan

1. *Yes.* Because: (1) The ruling classes now claim that every war—on their own side—is a defensive, and therefore justifiable war. (2) It is their confidence that the radical working class will support such a war that causes the capitalist governments to maintain military establishments and encourage aggressive diplomacy. (3) Militarism from within is a far greater disaster to a free people than any conceivable danger arising even from foreign invasion.

Substitutes for war are arbitration, open diplomacy, world courts, Bryan treaties, anything except leagues of peace founded on armament.

2. They should continue opposition. This opposition should be by the usual political and legislative methods of an opposition party, by refusal as individuals to enlist for war voluntarily or to be conscripted for war or non-combatant military service, and by writing, speaking, and holding meetings in advocacy of an early peace.

It was the support of the war by German Socialists after it began, through so-called loyalty to their country, that rendered that war possible, including the invasion of Belgium and the submarine warfare. If the rest of the army had been obliged to imprison the four million Socialist voters, keep guard over them and then proceed without their help, the history of the world would have been different. Now we are asked to do the same thing, to protest up to the declaration and then yield.

3. Yes, under all conditions. (Referendum.)

4. They should refuse to be conscripted for military or non-combatant service, because: (1) Fear of punishment is not a sufficient reason for the violation of internationalist ideals. (2) Conscription is the most extreme transgression of individual liberty, of body, mind and soul, and therefore should be resisted by every advocate of freedom, and (3) even in time of peace compulsory military service spells blind obedience and the stifling of the individual.

5. Maintenance of proper labor standards, relief of non-combatants in all countries affected, maintenance of free speech, etc.

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.

Walter E. Kruesi

1. No. Enter it promptly and effectively to enforce international agreements such as that guaranteeing Belgium, to rebuke and arrest such acts as the sinking of the Lusitania and the campaign

for the annihilation of the Armenian people.

2. No, if the declaration is in accordance with the established provisions of responsible government. Yes, if it develops, as it soon did in Germany, that the executive had tricked the parliament into acquiescence, had refused arbitration. By refusing to vote for supplies, or to vote confidence, by press and speech.

3. Yes, if the referendum is a tried and familiar instrument and it is applied simultaneously by both sides, with a provision for either compulsory voting or for rejection of all results unless at least 60 per cent. exercised their franchise, with a provision for an official statement of both sides to each voter.

4. They should strive for a universal service system as fair, economic, safe, democratic. Socialists should concentrate during war time on social use of national resources, social objectives to be attained through the war, strict limitation or elimination of profits through war trading.

WALTER E. KRUESI.

Algernon Lee

1. Modern wars fall into two classes —wars between imperialistic states and their actual or prospective victims, and wars among imperialistic states. The former are, in their nature, aggressive on one side and defensive on the other; the latter are essentially aggressive on both sides, although they may become incidentally defensive on one side or the other.

In the former case it may easily be the duty of Socialists in a subjugated country or one threatened with subjugation to give active and hearty support to a war for the preservation or the recovery of national independence; and it is necessarily the duty of Socialists in the imperialistic nation concerned to oppose the war policy of their own government not only before war commences, but also during its continuance.

In the latter case it is hard to imagine circumstances in which it would not be the duty of Socialists on both sides to oppose entry into war to the very limit of their ability.

A war of the second type once begun, there may arise on one side or the other (possibly on both sides, when groups of nations instead of single nations are involved) the question of defending the country from an invasion and perhaps from an attempt at subjugation or dismemberment incidental to the main purpose of the war. Whether and to what extent the Socialists of a given country ought to sanction and participate in such national defence must depend on special circumstances, among which are to be considered the practicability of the defence itself, the feeling of the population at large and especially of the proletariat, and the nature of the governments concerned. Thus, a successful German invasion of France and a successful German invasion of Russia might have very different effects upon the future liberty and progress of France and of Russia; and if so, the duty of the French and the Russian Socialists in the matter of national defence might not be the same. (NOTE—This was written before the recent revolutionary events in Russia had become known. These events confirm the view expressed. The military failure of the Russian autocracy has apparently hastened its downfall, which is a net gain for Socialism the world over. A similar military failure on the part of the French Republic would probably have strengthened the forces of reaction both in France and in Germany.)

Even in cases where the Socialists of a given country are obliged to give their sanction to the national defence, they have to limit their support of the government as much as possible, in order to prevent the defensive operations from becoming in turn aggressive in nature, and to prevent militaristic institutions and imperialistic policies from profiting by their support. In other words, I consider that the greatest evil which has resulted from the national defence attitude of various Socialist parties in Europe does not consist in their actual support of the war itself, in so far as the war is actually defensive in this or that case, but in the "burgfrieden" or suspension of the class struggle within the country and the loss of independent influence by the working class parties in internal as well as external affairs.

Let me add that, so far as concerns the United States, the views stated above leave no room for advocacy of war by American Socialists, but impose upon us the duty of steadfast opposition to any war which may be proposed, whether against Germany, Japan, England or other rival imperialistic powers or against Mexico or other Latin American states, which have only too good reason for fearing aggression by this country. Nor do I see any probability, in the event of war being forced upon us by our own ruling powers, of a situation arising in which it would become the duty of American Socialists to abate their opposition on the ground of the war having become incidentally one of defence.

As preventives of war (rather than "substitutes for war") we have to promote international agreements for simultaneous reduction of military and naval armaments, aiming at complete disarmament, and for mediation or arbitration of disputes between nations; within each country we have to strive for democratic control of foreign policy and combat imperialistic, protectionist and militaristic policies.

2. In every case where it is the duty of the Socialists to oppose entry into a war, it is also their duty to oppose its continuance if it comes in spite of their efforts—except, of course, in so far as the war on the part of their nation, aggressive in its origin, may later become actually defensive in its nature, as indicated above. The methods of such continued opposition must vary with varying circumstances. In any country where the Socialists are as yet decidedly in the minority, their main task during war as well as while it is impending, is that of enlightening the public and especially the proletariat as to the immediate and ultimate causes, the nature, and the effects of war and militarism. Wherever the Socialist movement itself is strong enough or where other elements in opposition to the war policy are strong enough, further action may be practicable. General strike, mutiny and insurrection are not only permissible but imperative if conditions are such as to favor their success; but a "general strike" that is not general, a mutiny or insurrection that can easily be crushed, is likely to weaken the proletariat and strengthen its enemies.

In this country unless there should arise a non-socialist opposition to war far more extensive and determined than we yet have reason to expect, the continuance and if possible the more vigorous prosecution of our work of economic and political education and organization of the proletariat must be our main concern, if war comes. The time is not yet here when we can give decisive battle to the forces of capitalism. Until that time comes, it is our duty to prepare for it by developing the class consciousness of the proletariat, not to strengthen the enemy by a premature attack which would be foredoomed to failure. The Italian Socialist party, the minorities in Germany and France, and the bulk of the Independent Labor party in Great Britain have set us instructive examples of what it is possible to do even in war time.

3. I think the value of the referendum in general is much overrated in this country, and especially in the matter of dealing with the war-danger. If the Federal Constitution provided for the submission of a proposed declaration of war to referendum it would not be difficult for the government to create such a situation at the critical moment as would bring out the affirmative vote it desired. This might even strengthen the position of the war party, by giving a factitious appearance of popular sanction to the war so brought about. Since I do not believe the referendum would work as its advocates expect, I think its advocacy in general a dangerous error; for it distracts attention from more useful lines of activity and, if it should be adopted, it would perhaps lull us into a mistaken feeling of security.

4. This question may mean either one or the other of two things:

(a) Ought we to oppose the enactment of a conscription law? Certainly we ought, and no matter in how mild a form it first appears. Six months' service, if it comes, will be only the entering wedge for a subsequent two-year or three-year law; and any so-called democratic features that may be incorporated in the original plan to disarm opposition can easily be eliminated after the militarists have won the main point of establishing

the legal principle of compulsory service. The military history of France, Prussia and other European countries demonstrates this; and even the Swiss system is becoming ever more dangerous to the Swiss democracy and labor movement.

(b) In the event of such a law being enacted, ought we to attempt to resist its enforcement? I regret that conditions are such that I cannot see the possibility of such attempted resistance producing good results that would be worth what they would cost. We were able to persuade only 3 per cent. of the voters to cast a straight Socialist ballot last fall. Can we reasonably expect to get even that proportion of the young men liable to military service to refuse to render it? I do not believe so. But refusal of service by so small a fraction as 3 per cent. of the conscripts would not materially weaken or decisively embarrass the forces of militarism in this country; on the other hand, not only would it expose many thousands of young men to very serious personal consequences, but it would probably absorb the whole energy of the party and bring its normal and basic activities to a standstill.

5. This has already been answered under the second question. To maintain the working class movement, in both its political and its industrial forms, to strengthen it numerically, financially and morally, to defend its already acquired legal rights and if possible with new ones, to uphold the standard of living of the proletariat against the depressing influences which war will accentuate, to promote the growth of class consciousness, to proclaim and emphasize the working class point of view upon every special question that may arise—this is the duty to which every other must be subordinated. Especially must we guard against the idea that the extension of government control or operation of industry, which now commonly accompanies war, has of itself a socialistic character or one favorable to the working class. Unless proletarian interests, present and future, are vigilantly and energetically protected at every point, this increase of government functions may permanently weaken the working class and give class rule a new lease of life.

ALGERNON LEE.

Charles H. Levermore

1 and 2. I believe that everybody should oppose entrance into any kind of war, because war is always the worst way out. The preferable solutions for critical situations are those which are offered by negotiations and by arbitral and judicial institutions. If such institutions do not exist in the international field they should be created there. At present there is only one such institution in existence for the use of all nations, and that is the permanent tribunal of arbitration at The Hague. After war actually begins it is too late, as a rule, to hope for any opportunity to employ arbitration. When the battle is on, the will-to-peace has departed. Before the battle begins, every good citizen should use all his influence to direct the power of public opinion towards the use of an international court, commissions of inquiry and councils of conciliation. After the die is cast and war becomes inevitable, no matter who or what is to blame for the calamity, I believe that it is justifiable for all citizens to unite in the loyal support of the properly constituted authorities of their nation. In fact no other course can be defended, unless persons are willing to become traitors to their nation and go over to the forces of an enemy. It is honorable to march with the community. It may be honorable to join its enemies and march against it. But it can never, in my judgment, be honorable or justifiable to remain in the community and yet try to paralyze its action, oppose its decisions and perhaps stab it in the back.

3. I do not believe in the referendum as a political device, under any circumstances. Therefore I naturally do not believe in using it with reference to a question of war. In our nation public opinion can speak very promptly if it knows its mind, and its various voices are not uncertain. But the theory of our government is that the voters select fit persons to undertake the responsibility of government. Undoubtedly the application of this theory always leaves much to be desired. But for my part I prefer government by the comparative inefficiency of chosen representatives in executive and legislative departments to

government by paralysis, which would be the inevitable result of the use of referendums. It is perfectly true that the most competent statesmen whom we have ever had in the presidency might well stagger under the pressure which that office brings with it. It seems to me equally clear that any man whom our voters are likely to place in the White House is far better able to give the decisions, whether for peace or war, than the confused chorus which must arise from eighteen millions of voters. I believe that the experts, if I may use so complimentary a word, whom the community selects to lead it, are more likely to lead it safely than the irreconcilable committees who head the numerous parties, factions and cliques which are always active in any democracy.

4. The term "conscription" ought to be defined. If it means military training, I believe that we must all accept it as the lesser of two evils. It is, in my judgment, unfortunately necessary that every nation in the enlightened world should be ready to mobilize its forces, animate and inanimate, promptly and efficiently. Every citizen should receive military training to such an extent that when the community in which he lives is threatened he will know just what he must do in the organized defence of his country, and just where he can find the needed equipment and supplies. This necessity will be laid upon us all, until the family of nations has developed a regime of law for and between nations, just as thoroughly as each nation has developed such a regime within its own borders. When universal public opinion enforces the administration of international justice, universal military training will no longer be necessary, since a comparatively small international police force will be sufficient to maintain order.

If conscription means liability to universal service in time of war it is, of course, unavoidable. When a community is fighting for its life, it must demand the help of every member of its community, and any person who is not willing to give that help must either quit the community or expect to be treated as a traitor.

5. Socialists and all other good citizens can work with all their powers in time of war to keep in the foreground an international view of affairs rather than the selfishly national view. No community can justify itself unless it can include in its plans a generous provision for the common welfare of all nations. We can all struggle against the evils of race hatred and prejudice which in time of war always tend to become extravagant and violent. It is always timely to discuss conditions of peace which a community should be willing to accept, and to be watchful for every proper opportunity to unite public opinion in the support of a righteous termination of war.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

Walter Lippmann

1. No. Because the alternative may be more disastrous than war itself—the substitute for war is not pacifism, but Socialism and political union and science.

2. It depends upon the war.

3. Not until secret diplomacy disappears.

4. Open-minded. Because it may be possible, to devise a form of military training which would make the democratic majority and especially the working class invincible.

5. On Socialism, on the preservation of essential liberties, on the conscription of income, on the leadership of foreign policy toward a league of nations.

6. Remarks: The golden rule, as Shaw says, is that there is no golden rule.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

W. P. Montague

1. Socialists should favor not only economic non-intercourse but active war in all cases in which, as in the present, an aggressive nation refuses methods of conciliation and aligns itself against peace, justice and democracy.

2. Even in war, conscientious workers for peace should be allowed to carry on freely all propaganda that does not injure the military strength of their country.

3. In general, yes; but hardly in the present case, because the case against Germany seems so clear that I cannot wish it to be jeopardized by an uninformed majority.

4. I think they should favor it (conscription), or still more universal training because it is necessary, just, democratic, and eugenic, but with very liberal provision for releasing all those but only those who are conscientiously opposed to the particular war that may be in question.

5. (1) Vigilant opposition to any national policy that is not in the interest of international justice. (2) Vigilant opposition to private profiting from the war, especially when at the expense of the country's workers. (3) A conscription of wealth far in excess of what is customary. (4) Overt acts of love and loyalty to the national flag interpreted as the symbol of the country's highest ideals but not of its power and prejudices—to the end that Socialist internationalism may be purged of a futile and vicious anti-nationalism.

W. P. MONTAGUE.

Scott Nearing

1. I believe all socially minded people should oppose entrance into war because war is probably the most disintegrating of all social forces. The best substitute for war that I know of is economic and social justice, intra-national as well as international.

2. I believe that the conscientious objectors in England are doing the only possible thing for right thinking people to do, that is, to refuse consistently to go into something in which they do not believe. You will remember what Thoreau wrote of the "duty of civil disobedience."

3. Answered in 1 and 2.

4. Answered in 1 and 2.

5. Superficially Socialists during war time should fight for free speech, free press and other forms of civil liberty. Fundamentally they should keep constantly in mind the necessity for social and economic readjustment which will make war impossible.

SCOTT NEARING.

Vida D. Scudder

1. No. Socialists should in general be in the front ranks of pacifism, but I am not prepared to take the extreme position that force is never justifiable in international relationships. Two types of war may be countenanced by Socialists, reluctantly and as a last resort: (a) Wars of chivalry, if such exist, when a strong people springs to the defense of a weak. There will never be a clear case of this kind, but when the plain people at large believe that they are called to fight for an unselfish cause I do not believe in checking their impulse. (b) Defensive war, when a country is actually invaded. Socialists should countenance no preparation for defense based on hypothetical danger. They should press for a policy courageous enough to take the risk; but if the attack is actually made, I think that group morality demands defense. Non-resistance is a counsel of perfection for the individual. When responsibility for others is involved, the case changes.

Substitutes for war. A world court, to which all international differences should be submitted. Universal free trade. Internationalized oceans. If the question means moral substitutes for war, Socialists might suggest Industrial Conscription, training the youth of the land to manliness and industrial efficiency for productive ends.

2. It depends on the type of war. If the war is one of the types mentioned above, chivalric or defensive, I think that direct and open opposition should cease. If it is a war of which the Socialist mind disapproves, I think that opposition should continue openly and with dignity. This for the sake of true national honor, compromised when a nation makes a false choice.

3. Uncertain. The right limits between representative and direct democracy have never yet been drawn. I fear a referendum on war, lest war fever sweep over the country, instigated by a yellow press and a militaristic aristocracy. On the other hand, a venture of faith in democracy may demand such referendum. I am not yet sure.

4. Unalterably opposed to conscription. The epoch when the civilized world

is learning the hideous results of military preparation is no time for our country to enter the vicious circle. Some nation must have the courage to stand firm against any increase of military preparation. That country should be ours. The whole genius of Socialism is opposed to compulsory military service.

5. Free speech, if that is constructive. Discovery and interpretation of the international mind, with a special effort to hold the best in the thought of each belligerent steadily before the other. A steady Socialist propaganda, pointing out the adoption of Socialistic measures by all countries, when real efficiency is needed. Also steady demand for the conscription of wealth, especially if life is conscripted. The watchful insistence on sacrifice from the propertied classes, at least commensurate with that demanded from labor.

6. I am inclined to think that a Christian ought to go further than this in a pacifist direction, but I do not see that a Socialist, as such, is bound to do so.

VIDA D. SCUDDER.

Henry Dwight Sedgwick

1. I divide wars into three kinds: (1) Aggressive war by us; (2) defensive war by us; (3) an aggressive war, like the present war, waged by one foreign state against another. These different cases require different action: in (1) opposition to the war; in(2) support of our government; in (3) action should be determined by the probable consequences to us and to Europe of a victory by the aggressor.

For 2, (defensive war)—A nation should defend itself because it can only promote social progress when politically independent; every man and every nation should insist upon the right to control its own conduct and to shoulder moral responsibility for that conduct.

For 3, (the present war)—Socialists should feel an international solidarity and realize that the triumph of the German aristocratic-military-capitalist-feudal system would be a defeat for democratic hopes everywhere; it would restore the despotic party in Russia and deal a hard blow at the Socialist parties in France and Belgium and at the British Labor Party. I think that Socialists assume too lightly that at this stage of the world a despotic feudal state, resting on a highly trained bureaucracy and a military organization of society, is impossible; it is only impossible if we make it impossible. A fundamental necessity for Socialist progress is to get rid of the whole inheritance from the feudal system—empire, hereditary rulers, aristocratic privileges, military renown, etc.—in short to deprive the capitalistic class of the immense support of a military organization of society.

2. My answer must be determined by the kind of war. Under 1—(aggressive war) yes; oppose the government by political means, by strikes, by general agitation. Under 2—(defensive war) and 3—(present war) no; because an aggressive war against us or against other innocent countries would only be waged by a state which was in the hands of the capitalistic, military and privileged classes and for the benefit of those classes and by resistance to such aggression we should be helping Socialist and Labor parties everywhere.

3. No. In time of danger you must act quickly. I do not think it would be possible to have an intelligent popular vote on the question in the brief time allowed without giving an audacious enemy an enormous advantage. It would be like stopping to consult your trainer before attempting to parry an uppercut. The reasons for and against war are often very complicated and it would be impossible to instruct the mass of voters on the matters at issue in less than six months. I am not much of a believer in the political wisdom of the majority in the absence of very full discussion. I have always found that in matters of art, literature, science, business or what not, the few were far more competent, energetic and clear-headed than the many. The problem of the many is to choose the few who will do justice to the needs of the many.

4. I believe in universal military training and in time of war in conscription. No rights without duties. Otherwise the military will consist of the master class and its dependents, and will tend

to favor existing privileges. Also in the matter of national defence, the nation should act as a unit.

5. In the present war, for instance, Socialists should do what they can to bring victory to the more democratic side, and strive mightily to abolish causes of war: imperial and imperialistic doctrines, military systems beyond a necessary minimum, private ammunition factories, ships of war as far as possible, military pomp, etc. Especially Socialists in all countries should be arranging for the best methods of acting together when terms of peace shall be made.

6. I think the Socialist party should make greater use of "young intellectuals" so-called. Two or three Socialist graduates from every college in the country should go to Germany, Russia, etc., to get into familiar relations with "young intellectuals" in other countries. There should be a sort of Socialist diplomatic service. This service should ultimately depend on the Executive Committee of the Party. Of course other countries should also send their "young intellectuals" here. I wish that the I. S. S. could start something of this sort.

HENRY DWIGHT SEDGWICK.

A. M. Simons

Literal application of half-baked dogmas has made Socialists and radicals ridiculous too often in the last few months. Therefore I am wary of simple affirmatives and negatives to such questions.

1. If an international war will abolish capitalism and that war is brought on by a capitalist class why should Socialists try to prevent the suicide? There are no substitutes for war. If the intention is to ask for other methods of testing social strength there are voting, argument, education, persuasion for domestic questions, and arbitration, diplomacy, treachery and similar methods internationally.

2. Opposition to a present war depends upon the answer to the question, Will the war abolish worse evils than it brings? Wars of conquest, imperialism, commercialism, dynastic influence or for ruling or exploiting class interests of any kind should be opposed even unto the deaths of the workers who must die in such wars. They had better die for principle than for their rulers.

3. A referendum on war is of value only as an argumentative exercise by those who are sure it will not be tried. None but imbeciles would suggest it if they thought it would be tested. The announcement of such a referendum anywhere but in what Bert Leston Taylor calls "those ultra-violet regions where thought waves do not register" would immediately precipitate a war upon the idealistically idiotic nation that was engaged in a referendum. The time to take referendums is when electing officials. If these represent ruling class interests we will have wars when those interests demand it. If the officials represent working class interests wars will only come in defense of those interests. I cannot now imagine a case in which working-class interests would lead to a military conflict of nations. But I can imagine a war started by other interests in which the workers might be much interested.

4. If national existence is really threatened and all energies are required it seems unfair to conscript by means of public opinion, social ostracism and industrial blacklisting and call it a volunteer system. Such methods are apt to take the most desirable social elements. The pacifists, who certainly represent an advanced social consciousness, are saved only at the cost of their social influence. Yet there is great value in the spirit of resistance to compulsory service, perhaps enough to justify all the evils of volunteering. A nation sufficiently docile for efficient military organization under an autocracy is a dangerous social atavism. Each case requires special judgment. This is so generally true of social problems that generalizations and rules of thumb are very dangerous.

5. By far the most important measure to be urged by Socialists in case of war is the payment of all expenses from direct taxation of incomes and confiscation of property. This should be recognized by anyone who knows the first syllable of the economic interpretation of society. This will stop the war or socialize all property. It is also good public

financing. All financiers agree to this as applying to past wars. There is no way to pass burdens on to future generations. If there were, all burdens could be handed on to the generation of that to-morrow which never comes. We could all live while the living is good. Bonds only use the power of government to bind future producers to future owners.

As a corollary to this, Socialists should seek to increase the power of labor in every field. Modern wars rest on "mobilization of industry." If labor can run industry and take possession, through taxation for war purposes, of all industry, we shall have Socialism. The object of Socialism in peace or war is to socialize and democratize industry.

A. M. SIMONS.

John Spargo

1. To the first group of questions I beg to say that, while in my judgment Socialists must generally oppose entrance into international war, there are, or rather there may be, exceptions to that rule. I can imagine, for example, several nations, e. g., England, France, the United States and Germany, with Socialist governments, earnestly trying to realize Socialist ideals, with other great nations, e. g., Russia, Japan, China and Mexico, still under capitalist-imperialist domination. If in such circumstances one of the former group should be assailed by one of the latter or by a group of the latter powers it would be sound Socialist policy—and what is after all the same thing, simple international morality—for the other powers in the first group to enter the war on behalf of their sister Socialist nation. Another conceivable occasion for Socialists to enter war would be: the rising of the people in one country to establish a social republic, being endangered by the support given to the challenged ruling class by the ruling classes of other lands. In such a case foreign volunteer regiments of Socialists could very properly assist their struggling comrades as Lafayette and his friends helped the American colonies against England. If Socialist governments existed anywhere, they could with equal propriety aid the struggle for democracy. Personally I do not see how any doubt on this point can exist in the Socialist mind. Finally, I think that a league of nations would be justified in making war on a nation which persistently violated the laws agreed upon for the international well-being, especially a nation which refused to accept arbitration.

2. It is quite impossible for me to lay down hard and fast rules to govern the conditions outlined in this group of questions. If the war itself was clearly unjustified the continuance of resistance to it would be desirable. If the war was clearly justifiable continuance of resistance to it by those who opposed it in spite of its justification—from religious sources, for example—would be undesirable. Thus, as I see it, the German Socialists who still oppose the war for which their government is primarily responsible, are doing a great service to international Socialism, while those French Socialists who continue to oppose the prosecution of the war which was forced on their nation, and thus are doing that which is of the greatest service to the German government, are doing a dis-service to international Socialism.

3. Wherever it is practicable to have a referendum on the subject of participation in war, I favor it. For example, the question, "Shall we send armed forces or supplies to help the people of Germany win their social revolution against the combination of Hohenzollern and Romanoff powers which is trying to crush them?" might be made the subject of popular referendum. But not many international crises can be so dealt with, in my judgment. Certainly, there can be no sense in taking a popular referendum on whether or no the nation shall be defended against an invading enemy. That would be sheer insanity, and would, in theory certainly, and in practice if men were ever insane enough to put the theory into operation, leave a Socialist civilization defenseless against a barbarian invasion.

4. To conscription, as that term is generally understood, I am opposed. I am likewise opposed to "the universal arming of citizens," the so-called "armed nation," which so many of my fellow Socialists have favored. Utterly useless

from the point of view of military efficiency, it would be disastrous from the viewpoint of the proletarian struggle. The alien proletariat, which means the mass of our unskilled workers, would be at the mercy of those "citizens' committees" and "alliances" which in so many places have crushed the labor unions. Then, too, there is the great danger of civil war on race lines, especially between whites and negroes. With an armed citizenry the assault of a drunken or crazy negro on a white woman would be too likely to lead to a widespread race war.

I am disposed to believe in universal compulsory public service for both sexes. Such service, constructive in character, not destructive as military service generally is, would have all the advantages of military service without its evils. It would inculcate "patriotism," service to the state; it would promote what Mr. Roosevelt calls "the democracy of the dog tent"; it would teach the art of working together in organized masses under proper discipline. But it would be used for construction—such as irrigation of deserts, reclamation of swamps, making highways, building sewer systems, forest service and so on. Such constructive universal compulsory service would, moreover, provide us with the power of adequate national self-defense.

5. On the preservation and, wherever possible, the extension of popular liberty; on measures to protect prisoners of war and to exempt non-combatants; measures to limit the area and the terrors of war wherever possible, and to oppose the reversion to brutal methods already outgrown and outlawed by agreements of nations; to promote all measures for the sort of peace which will further the interests of international social democracy. (This last named may require firm opposition to "peace movements" which arise during war, when it is clear that such peace movements would then strengthen the natural enemies of Socialism.)

JOHN SPARGO.

J. G. Phelps Stokes

1 and 2. Socialists should resist by force of arms if need be every effort to lessen liberties that mankind has already secured; and should support every effort to advance the cause of liberty, even though the use of arms be at times required to remove great obstacles from the way. They should remember that the advancement of the cause of liberty requires, at times, temporary curtailment of the liberties of anti-social individuals or groups who seriously hamper liberty's general progress.

3. If there is time for calm consideration of the issues involved, by an intelligent and *well-informed* electorate —yes; otherwise no.

4. Conscription in an emergency is a poor substitute for universal training and service during brief periods in each citizen's life. Where the entire electorate are so trained as to be capable of bearing arms efficiently and are experienced in highly organized collective action, the danger of their being oppressed against their will by lesser groups approaches *nil,* and the danger of their oppression by equal or larger groups is enormously reduced, and their ability to secure still greater liberties is immeasurably increased. (I have used the phrase "against their will" purposely, since it is evident that the electorate often submit of choice to political and economic conditions and methods that are in effect unrecognized oppression.)

5. All within appropriate age groups should offer to take their places in the ranks, or wherever their services are most required, and should submit gladly to the authority of those democratically appointed to lead or command them. "Democratic appointment" does not necessarily mean appointment by referendum or election, but may and usually does mean appointment by those representatives and agents of the people who in public office exercise authority democratically granted. Individuals who demonstrate special qualifications for more constructive work or for leadership should apply themselves to such special tasks as are assigned them by the appropriate authorities. Incidentally, all should exercise such influence as they can to promote to the utmost the collective organization of industry for public use and service instead of for private profit.

6. Unwillingness to take orders in a public emergency, from democratically constituted public authorities, and unwillingness to fit oneself for emergency public service under the direction of appropriate representatives and agents of the electorate, would usually be base, and unworthy of anyone calling himself either a Socialist or a citizen, and doubly unworthy of one calling himself both.

J. G. Phelps Stokes.

Alexander Trachtenberg

1. In my opinion the Socialists should oppose the entrance and participation in any international war. I believe that every war in which the working class will naturally be drafted to serve will tend to neutralize the class struggle and will make for what is called a civil peace between the revolutionary working class organization and the existing capitalist government on the one hand and for economic peace between the trade unions and the employers. I believe such a condition detrimental to the interests of the labor movement and contrary to the purposes and mission of the working class.

2. I hold that should war be declared the Socialists must continue their relentless opposition to war and wage a campaign for immediate peace. The various middle class elements which make up the pacifist organizations will generally give up their peace activity after the outbreak of war. It then behooves the Socialist movement as the revolutionary minority to represent the interests of the people and carry on an agitation against militarism and war. Such an agitation is especially necessary because of the reactionary influence that a country under military regime during war has upon the democratic institutions. It is the duty of the Socialist movement to fight for the maintenance of those democratic institutions which prevailed before the beginning of the war.

3. I have not yet made up my mind as to whether a war referendum would be advisable. While the holding of a referendum introduces an element of time during which the passions of the legislators who will have to say whether or not there should be war, may be cooled off, yet a jingo press may stampede the population to vote for war since they are the makers of public opinion and will in the long run determine the vote in that referendum.

4. The Socialists should oppose conscription because the militarism of the country will work against the democratic aims and achievements of the labor movement. Compulsory military service will take away from active industrial pursuits many young people who will make up an idle and privileged class and will constitute a serious menace to the individual liberties of the civil population. A standing army will be the cause of international war and will be used as a weapon against the workers within the country since the employer can secure the aid of the government in settling indusdustrial disputes by military force.

Alex. Trachtenberg.

Wm. English Walling

1. Socialists should favor war in two cases: (a) In the case of an unjustifiable attack on their country or any of its citizens by land or sea and (b) where a group of nations exists, or is in process of formation, which is fighting for the preservation of international law as it has existed up to the present time—provided a majority of such a group of nations are political democracies.

The only effective substitute for war (and even this is only a partial and occasional substitute) is an economic league of nations powerful enough economically to repress and discipline any aggressive minority. Both in the case of the military league above mentioned and in the case of an economic league, the majority, to be effective, would have to have something like twice the military and economic strength of any probable criminal minority. This need not mean quite two-thirds of the world's economic and military power, however, as the fact that a few minor nations (composing, say, 10 to 20 per cent. of the world's military and economic power) stayed outside of both the policing majority and the criminal minority, would not affect the result in any way.

2. Modern wars are between peoples and not between governments, as this war has distinctly shown. Neither peoples nor governments *declare* war. Governments, but not peoples, *make* war for the simple reason that it is only through an organized government that a people can make war. When a democratic government feels that the time for making war has arrived, it proceeds to do so, and the people's support is immediately forthcoming. The reason for this is that under the capitalist system the nations are economic competitors with one another. This brings them into economic conflicts and keeps them always on the verge of military hostilities. The only way this can be prevented under capitalism is that the nations should join together in larger and larger economic groups, as they are doing—until finally a large preponderating group, or trust of nations, gains the controlling power over the world. Thus the nations are tied together economically until finally the larger part of the world may be so tied together in a single economic group, into a trust of nations. At the beginning of the war, Kautsky predicted that this would be the way and the only way by which permanent peace would come. Otto Bauer, who was appointed by the International Socialist Bureau to report on the subject of Imperialism at the International Congress that was to have been held at Vienna in August, 1914, points out that at the present time not only the governments but the peoples of the world (including the working peoples) are held in a position of economic antagonism, which keeps the world on the verge of wars.

3. No Socialist party in the world, except that of the United States, has ever adopted or even discussed the silly proposition of a referendum on war. International situations making for war or peace change from hour to hour. While it is not necessary to concentrate power in the hands of a single man, as is done by the Constitution of the United States, it is necessary to leave it in the hands of an effective executive group, either a relatively small legislative body of a hundred or a few hundred members, or a cabinet of from five to twenty-five members.

Such bodies can be absolutely responsible to the people, and can represent the popular will a thousand times better than a referendum. A referendum would have to be composed not of one but of thousands of questions, and the larger part of these would be out of date before the referendum was finished. It would represent not the popular will, but the influence of the most unscrupulous yellow press and politicians—for the simple reason that the time would be too short to get all the facts before the people, but quite long enough to spread the most dangerous of lies, especially against foreign peoples and nations which could not protect themselves.

4. All the Socialist parties of the world, except in the English-speaking countries, are practically unanimously in favor of conscription. In Great Britain the Labor Party and the Fabian Socialists favor national industrial and military enlistment. Conscription was beaten in Australia by the Catholic Church and the farmers who did not want to lose their laborers, and other sinister forces and then it was beaten by a very narrow margin. It cannot be questioned for a moment that 90 per cent. of the organized and class-conscious working people of the world are in favor of conscription—where the governments are as democratic as those of France, Great Britain, Australia, Switzerland, etc. It has not seemed up to the present moment that there was any necessity for a large army in this country. I do not know whether that moment has yet arrived, but when it does arrive—and the day may not be far off—universal military service will be favored by the overwhelming majority of the American working people—with the sole exception of those whose foreign affiliations are more important than their American connections. These foreigners in America, for the most part, have favored and still favor compulsory military service for their own countries, but they do not object to leaving America helpless. As internationalists, American Socialists can not wish that this country should be the weakest in the world from the military point of view, because they are certain that we are among the half dozen most democratic nations of the world. They have only consented that we should remain in a state of relative military weak-

ness on the supposition that we would have no use for a large army and that there would be no danger of an attack on America or on our ships and citizens on the oceans. As soon as there is such a danger of attack, our duty to internationalism requires that we should do our share to defend existing international law and existing democracy—for feeble as they are, the present international law is a long way in advance of primitive savagery and the present democracies of the world mark a very considerable step towards real democracy.

5. The constructive measures Socialists should advocate in war time are twofold. They should insist upon democratic representation and control on all special governing bodies instituted for the period of the war. Second, they should take advantage of the war and promote all the forms of State Socialism which it brings—in the hope and belief of being able both during the war and after it to extend democratic control.

WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING.

Mr. and Mrs. James P. Warbasse

1. Socialists and other socially-minded groups should oppose entrance into every international war. War retards social progress, and damages the workers more than the privileged class (substitutes). Social justice at home and international arbitration abroad.

2. Yes. By doing all they can to stop the war.

3. Yes. Because an advisory war referendum secures the expression of the people. Under all conditions when war is contemplated by a government.

4. Opposed to it (conscription). It is undemocratic; it makes for war and militarism, which are inimical to the best interests of the people.

5. Opposition to war and the advocacy of arbitration.

J. P. and A. D. WARBASSE.

Charles Zueblin

1. Socialists should oppose an attack on the sovereignty of any other people. Socialists should urge universal law in place of international law as illustrated by the International Postal Union.

2. Socialists should pave the way for peace. They may hurt legitimate nationalism by mere antagonism, and probably hurt Socialist propaganda.

3. Yes.

4. Socialists should promote universal service as the only way to beat universal military service or training. It should include both sexes.

5. Socialists should concentrate during war time on nationalizing communication, democratizing industry and politics. They should use all mobilization to get national control of those things that can most feasibly be continued after the war.

6. Above all they should not be negative or partisan; should be aggressively national or humanitarian.

CHARLES ZUEBLIN.

The following communication, though not strictly in line with the articles in the above symposium, is here inserted on account of its interesting suggestions to non-combatants during the present war.

Sir:

For possible non-combatants during the war, various tasks may be suggested, such as (1) serving on committees for relief and for governmental control of necessities; (2) helping to safeguard legal rights and maintain labor standards; (3) agitating for conscription of wealth rather than conscription of men, and for a peace that shall further true internationalism and democracy; in short, cooperating in every effort against official and private oppression and for the attainment of the highest social ideals. The Friends, for example, have recently formed a committee (Prof. Cadbury of Haverford, chairman) to find farm and other work for "conscientious objectors."

Helen Phelps Stokes.

The Russian Revolution

By Alexander Trachtenberg

A few weeks ago the progressive world was overjoyed to learn that a successful revolution had taken place in Russia and that the ancient rule of the Romanoffs was at an end. Strangely enough conservatives and reactionaries joined in the jubilation, together with exiled revolutionists, and for a time one wondered whether the Russian Revolution was not one of those paradoxical phenomena for which no explanation could be found. We were treated by the newspapers to accounts of the Revolution which led us to believe that the autocratic regime was overthrown practically by the members of the Duma in cooperation with the leaders of the middle class and persons of great wealth. M. Rodzianko, president of the Duma, Prince George Lvov, well-known Zemstvo leader and Professor Paul Milyukov, leader of the Constitutionalists-Democrats were referred to as the revolutionary trinity who stood at the helm of the Revolution and were largely responsible for the speedy removal of the ancient autocracy and the installation of a free and popular form of government. We were also apprised by the newspapers that the Revolution in Russia was made with the express purpose of prosecuting the war to a victorious end and that the leading generals in the army were in sympathy with its purpose and spirit.

Soon after we were informed that, as a preliminary to the downfall of the monarchy, revolutionary soldiers and workers were fighting with the defenders of the old regime in the streets of Petrograd and that the red flag was being hoisted at places won in the combat. It was difficult for former Russian revolutionists to imagine Rodzianko, great land-owner in Ekaterinoslav; Goutchkov, former president of the Second Duma and millionaire banker from Moscow; Terestchenko, millionaire sugar king, and Konovalov, wealthy manufacturer, to have anything in common with the workers who were fighting behind barricades on the streets of Petrograd. It was equally impossible to think of Milyukov in connection with the hoisting of the emblem of revolutionary international Socialism on captured government buildings, for did he not refer to this same emblem in 1905 as the "red rag of the discontented?"

Those who participated in the revolutionary movement in Russia at any period during the last twenty-five years know that the recent Revolution was but another chapter in the history of the struggle for a free and democratic form of government. First came the propaganda and agitation period in the '80's and the '90's—when students and advanced workmen were spreading the ideal of Socialism among the masses. The beginning of the century witnessed the organization period and the preparation for a popular movement against the autocratic government. Secret groups of workers and peasants were formed all over the land. Many of the leaders were captured by the government, imprisoned, exiled or put to death. Others, however, took their places and the work of enlightenment went on. Then came the Russo-Japanese War in 1904 and as the armies were going down to defeat and graft scandals implicating members of the ruling class were revealed, the whole bureaucratic system was laid bare.

The general strike in October, 1905, and the uprising of workers in all the industrial centers of the country were the first revolutionary mass movements of the Russian people against the autocratic regime. The government was forced to capitulate and granted a constitution guaranteeing liberties which were formerly denied. The Duma was the heritage of the Revolution of 1905 and though reaction followed this uprising and most of the promises contained in the manifesto of October 30 were broken, yet the principle of representative government was established and—what was more important—the people, bap-

tized in the Revolution, learned of the power of organization and became determined to continue their struggle for a democratic republic.

When the present war broke out, the government found the workers opposed to war and unwilling to make civil peace. Anti-war demonstrations were many times attempted and great quantities of literature accusing the government of plotting this war and demanding its immediate discontinuance, were secretly distributed. The Socialist members of the Duma voted against the war budget and openly assailed the imperialistic policy of the government. Five deputies were sent to Siberia and wholesale arrests were made among the revolutionary workmen who began to prepare for another assault on the reactionary government.

As time went on, as governmental corruption was again unearthed and misery and desolation became more and more widespread, the Revolutionary organizations crystallized the demands of the masses of the people in the slogan "Bread and Peace," the guiding motto during the March, 1917, uprising.

At the same time that the workers were organizing their councils and were secretly preparing to attack the discredited government the armies were being replenished with soldiers from the reserve, peasants and workers, who participated in former revolutionary uprisings and were bitterly opposed to the government. Revolutionary groups were formed among the soldiers and these began to cooperate with the workers' organization with a view to concerted action. The open struggle which ensued in the revolutionary month of March was inspired and directed by the Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. According to late reports, no less than two thousand fell in the struggle. The members of the parties of which Rodzianko and Milyukov are the leaders neither participated in the mutinies among the soldiers, in strikes on the railroads, in factories and shops, nor in the street fighting. The Octobrists (representing big business) and their friends, the Constitutionalists-Democrats (the liberals) rushed in at the end of the conflict and reaped the benefits of the struggle in the same way as did the bourgeoisie during the preceding revolutions in other countries.

The recent Revolution finds the Russian workers, however, well organized and determined to accomplish their ends, which are an immediate ending of the present war and the establishment of a democratic republic in Russia.

The appointment of Deputy Kerensky, a communistic Socialist and leader of the Group of Toil (a peasant group) as Minister of Justice, and the constant negotiations of the new government with the Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies through their spokesman, Deputy Tcheidze, the brilliant leader of the Socialist group in the Duma, shows that the provisional government has to reckon with those who stood the brunt of this Revolution and who will not permit any compromise with the old regime or any attempts to prevent a complete victory for the people.

In 1905 the liberal middle class stood by and watched the workers and peasants bleed for freedom in Russia. They wished the Revolution success, as the downfall of the feudal autocracy would mean much for capitalist development in Russia.

In 1917, when the Revolution, born in the anti-war movement among the masses, sent the old regime tottering and was about to be crowned with complete success, the capitalist and middle classes of Russia acclaimed the struggle as their own; put their official stamp of approval on it and proclaimed it a pro-war revolution. That is the extent to which they contributed to the Great Russian Revolution!

The slogan "A Constituent Assembly Elected on the Basis of Universal and Equal Suffrage" was written on the banner of the Revolution in 1905. Nothing short of a democratic republic will now be accepted by the working class of Russia as their reward for the Revolution of March, 1917. We already have full assurance that the demands of the revolutionary parties will be heeded.

Lecture Trips

JOHN SPARGO'S TRIP TO THE COAST

In many ways the trip of John Spargo to the Pacific Coast has been the most successful ever conducted by the Society. The first part was briefly recorded in the last issue of the Magazine. From Guilford, N. C., Mr. Spargo went to Winston-Salem, N. C., and thence to Columbia, S. C. Prof. Joshua Morse of the University of South Carolina writes: "Mr. Spargo gave us three splendid lectures and a talk in chapel. I have no hesitancy in saying that we are indebted to the I. S. S. for the best lectures we have had this year." Of the next stop at Atlanta, Ga., Mrs. Millis says: "The visit of Mr. Spargo was a great success and some of us think that it will mark the beginning of a change in sentiment toward Socialism in the city. . The co-operation of the Women's Suffrage Organization enabled us to secure much publicity in the press that we never have had before, except during the visit of Mrs. Stokes.

"On Saturday we had a supper. This was followed by a lecture on Suffrage at the Auditorium of the Chamber of Commerce, attended by some 100, and one under the auspices of the Socialist Party, attendance about 500. On Monday, Comrade Spargo spoke at Agnes Scott College, where admission has previously been denied us."

From Atlanta Mr. Spargo went to Nashville, Tenn., where he spoke in George Peabody College to about 300 students and later in the day to 175 at Ward Belmont. In St. Louis he had splendid meetings at the City Club, before the Socialist Party, Hebrew organizations, etc. The attendances were: 200, 275, 75, 250 and 2,000.

On account of delay in trains he was unable to reach the Columbia, Mo., meeting at the University of Missouri. He therefore went immediately to Kansas City, where he addressed the City Club, Dr. Turk's Forum and the Socialist Party. The meetings at the University of Kansas were eminently successful. At the afternoon lecture the audience was fully 1,200 and very enthusiastic. In the evening he was the guest of the University Club at Eureka. From there he went to Winfield, Kansas, where he spoke at Southwestern University to some 475, and from there visited Manhattan, addressing the Kansas State Agricultural College at morning chapel—attendance 780—on the "I. S. S., Its Aims and Methods," Prof. Kammeyer's class on "Syndicalism and Its Methods" and an audience of 400 in the afternoon on "The Real Meaning of Socialism" and at night to the local Socialist Party on "Organization." The next day he conferred with individual students and that night spoke to the Party on "The Spiritual Significance of Modern Socialism," attendance 375.

At Denver he had an exceptionally busy day speaking at the University to 225, before two classes, on "The Real Meaning of Socialism"; to a class of 20 on the "Democratization of Industry"; to 380 students on "Problems of Child Welfare" before five combined classes; to an evening class at the School of Commerce on "A Plea for Industrial Democracy," attendance 25, followed by a lecture before 250 at the Y. W. C. A.

Boulder, Colo., was the next place visited. Here he addressed 300 students at the University of Colorado at the organization meeting of the Students' Forum. The next morning he spoke before a class of 75 students on "Sociological Effects of the War."

Before going to the Pacific Coast, Mr. Spargo stopped at Salt Lake City, where he spoke at the University and was unfortunately snowbound for several days. At Los Angeles he delivered twelve lectures and addresses, seven of which were in colleges and schools. At these seven meetings there was an aggregate attendance of 4,200 students and faculty members and at the other five public addresses, the aggregate attendance was 1,750.

There was a good attendance at Palo Alto on March 5th. There was no chance to get into Leland Stanford, owing to crowded conditions of program. On March 6th, he addressed a meeting at the University of California, Berkeley, Cal. Although there were six other lectures and events on the Campus at the same hour, he had one of the largest audiences of the year—about 650. The interest was very intense; the speaker stayed on questions until "lights out!" was ordered. Mr. Spargo laid the foundation of a Chapter.

The following day, Mr. Spargo spoke at Oakland High School for about an hour to a magnificent audience of 1,000, and to an audience of 600 at Plymouth Center. On March 8th, he lectured before the San Francisco Local and, despite the storm, had a fine meeting. At the two Universities and school lectures, the audiences totalled 1,760; at the three public lectures about 1,575. He was overwhelmed with invitations to return.

On March 11th, he spoke at the University of Oregon at Eugene. As college buildings could be had on Sundays for religious meetings only, the Unitarian Church was used. Many had to be turned away.

In Portland, Oregon, he spoke on Monday night, March 12th, at a dinner by the I. S. S. Tuesday he gave two lectures in Reed College, a talk before the Women's Study Club, attendance 400, and an evening lecture before 1,000 with hundreds turned away. On Wednesday two addresses were given at Corvallis, Oregon, at the Oregon Agricultural College before no less than 2,100 students. That evening he spoke again at Portland, where there was another large meeting with an attendance of 1,000. Two further talks were given at Reed College on Thursday. Friday in Seattle at the University of Washington he spoke to a packed attendance of 2,000 and at night to the Young People's Socialist League to about 400.

From Seattle Mr. Spargo went to Spokane, where he had a splendid meeting before the

People's Forum where there was an audience of some 900.

At Missoula, Montana, his next stop, he spoke at another large meeting at the University and at night before the Socialist Party. At Butte, Montana, fearing an anti-war meeting, the authorities of the city prevented Mr. Spargo from speaking. From there he went to Lincoln, Nebraska, where he lectured before a Social Ethics class in one of the churches and at night to an audience of 600 at the Forum. After a few meetings in Iowa, he left for the St. Louis Socialist Party Convention.

TRIP OF IRWIN TUCKER IN THE MIDDLE WEST

On February 12 the Chicago Alumni Chapter held a dinner to consider the question of coal, which that day had struck the high record of $7.50 per ton. The speakers were Scott Nearing, of the University of Toledo, and Adolph Germer, national executive secretary of the Socialist Party. One hundred persons attended. A collection of $28 was taken to defray the expenses of the organizing trip about to be begun through the Illinois colleges.

The following morning Mr. Tucker addressed the student body of Eureka College in chapel, also combined classes on economics, sociology and ethics. When the call was given for signers to the I. S. S. Chapter charter, thirty-two responded, with the dean of the College, Prof. A. C. Gray, the College chaplain, and two more of the professors heading the list. Miss Ann Batterton was elected secretary.

Thence Mr. Tucker went to Purdue University. Unfortunately the championship basketball game between Purdue and Chicago was being played that evening, and also there was the chief scientific lecture of the year before the faculty. The gathering was consequently small, but enthusiastic. A small chapter was organized. Next morning Mr. Tucker addressed the senior class in economics for Prof. E. H. Davis, registrar of the University. That evening he spoke at the University of Indiana at Bloomington, Ind., on "Socialism as an American ideal." A good Chapter is already in existence there, having been reorganized by Miss Daphne M. Hoffman, of the faculty. Fourteen new members were added.

On the fifteenth at eight p. m. Mr. Tucker spoke in the auditorium of the State Normal School at Bloomington, Ill., Prof. Manchester being chairman. Next morning he addressed the full chapel assembly on "Education and the Migratory Worker"; and also spoke before two classes in economics, one elementary and one advanced. The President, David M. Felmly, is a strong single-taxer, and did all he could to aid the work there. Thence he went to Lincoln College, at Lincoln, Ill., and spoke in chapel there at the invitation of President class in ethics, and dined at the presidential J. H. McHenry. Later he spoke before his residence.

It was found impracticable to address the students at Illinois, Wesleyan, or Milliken University, Decatur, because of the Week of Prayer meetings, which took up all available time. His next visit was therefore to the Illinois Woman's College at Jacksonville, Ill., where he spoke on February 20 in the College chapel. Some members of the faculty of Illinois College, a different institution in the same town, were present, and arranged to have Mr. Tucker address the chapel assembly at the Illinois College on the following day at 9.50. Following this, he again spoke at Woman's College before the class in ethics; then at the Illinois College for another talk requested by the students, which lasted from 3.30 to 6 o'clock. He afterward addressed the congregation at Trinity Episcopal Church at the Ash Wednesday service.

Blackburn College, Carlinville, was the next stop. It is a "self-help" college, all the students working their way through on the college farm. He addressed the Dean's class in European History on "Root Causes of the European War" at 11. At 2.15 all classes were dismissed for the afternoon and the student body assembled in the chapel for more than two hours while they discussed the social crisis from the standpoint of Socialism. Here forty-two signatures to the I. S. S. membership application blank were secured.

Following this Mr. Tucker went to St. Louis, where he had been invited to spend two weeks under the auspices of the Episcopal Church, and speak on the moral challenge of Socialism. This invitation seemed to him very important and very significant of the liberality of the church, for St. Louis is the home town of the Presiding Bishop and the Lenten services are invariably given great publicity. Mr. Tucker made twenty addresses, and was guest of honor at various clubs, including the I. S. S. Chapter. He made a trip to University of Missouri at Columbia, where he spoke to the I. S. S. Chapter.

As a result of constant intensive work between these various addresses and luncheons, an I. S. S. alumni Chapter of twenty-five charter members was organized, with Dr. Gustave Lippmann as President, Rev. George F. Taylor, Secretary, Frank P. O'Hare, Treasurer, and an executive committee of five. They have started off with enthusiasm to roll up a membership of 100.

MR. LAIDLER'S TRIP

Dr. Harry W. Laidler began his trip to the Middle West on March 7, on that date speaking at Ohio Wesleyan to an audience of fifty. About a dozen signed to reorganize a Chapter.

March 8th, he addressed a group of faculty members in the Political Science department of the State University, and the following day spoke at a meeting of the I. S. S. In Cincinnati, where he stopped next, he gave two talks at the University of Cincinnati and others before the Social Workers Club and the Young People's Socialist League.

On March 14th, he spoke at the Chapel exercises at Earlham College, a co-educational Quaker institution, and had a very enthusiastic reception. This was followed by an address in the Chapel of Miami University, Oxford, on "The Social Responsibility of Collegians."

Mr. Laidler again returned to Indiana, and spoke on the night of the 15th before the I. S. S. Chapter at Bloomington on "The Social Challenge to the College Bred." The Chapter here has a number of live spirits. The following morning he addressed Professor Streightoff's economics and Professor Carson's history classes at De Pauw University, and in the afternoon helped in the formation of an I. S. S. Chapter. His next address was on Friday evening at Wabash College, where he was introduced to 60 or more students of Professor Leonard. It is hoped an organization will be formed as a result of his visit.

On the following Sunday Mr. Laidler addressed the Socialist Party in Crawfordsville. The next day was the most strenuous day of the trip. The Organizing Secretary spoke on "Modern Industrial and Social Conditions" before an 8 o'clock English class at Purdue University. This was followed by lectures on this subject and on "The Labor Movement Here and Abroad," before combined English and economics classes—ten classes in all—during the three succeeding periods. Two fraternity groups were told of the activities of the I. S. S. at noon, and at dinner, and at 7:30 in the evening an address was given in the College Library Hall, after which an organization was perfected. The officers of the organization are President, Mr. Hume, and Secretary, Mr. Fox.

From Purdue Mr. Laidler went to Chicago, where he conferred with the Middle Western Committee and thence to the University of Illinois, where he spoke on "Socialism and the War." At this University no less than a score of members of the Faculty belong to the I. S. S. Chapter. On the following Sunday evening talks were given before students of Valparaiso University. On Monday evening the students of Heidelberg College were addressed and on Tuesday Mr. Laidler organized a Columbus Alumni Chapter of the Society, after an address in one of the rooms of Washington Gladden's former church. The officers of the newly formed Chapter are: President, Ammon Hennacy; Secretary, Mrs. Thos. C. Southard; Executive Committee, Fred. L. Brownlee, Edna A. Stone.

On Thursday morning the organizing secretary spoke before two combined economics classes of Western Reserve at the invitation of Arthur Arbuthnot and while in town assisted in reorganizing the Cleveland Alumni Chapter. Saturday and Sunday were spent at Hobart College, Geneva, and an informal talk was given before the Commons Club on Saturday evening. The College building, after having been granted for a meeting, had been withdrawn by the members of the Board of Trustees. A considerable number of students attended the forum meeting at St. Peter's Episcopal Church on Sunday evening.

Next and last stop on April the second was at the University of Buffalo, where an address was given at the weekly Chapel exercises on "Ideals and Achievements of Modern Socialism."

College Notes

NEW ENGLAND COLLEGES

Berkeley Divinity Chapter held a meeting on January 8th, addressed by Rev. Irwin Tucker, on "Educational Work in Chicago." On January 17, Rev. Israel Brown spoke on "Socialism and the Clergy,' and on February 15 Rev. Dr. Washburn had as his topic "The War and Other Questions." "Our program," writes Henry H. Daniels, the secretary, "was interrupted by the death of two members of our Faculty. We expect to hold more meetings before the close of the school year."

The Radcliffe Socialist Study Club now consists of thirty-five members. On December 12 a study circle meeting was held, at which the Fabian Essays and "New Worlds for Old" were the subjects. On February 12 the report of the Industrial Relations Commission was taken up, and on March 6 Carl Wheat and Carroll Binder led a discussion of America's position in the world war. This third meeting was a joint meeting with the Harvard Socialist Club. The speeches were short and the discussions interesting. It is expected that this practise of the two clubs meeting together will be continued in the future, according to Beatrice Jones, secretary.

George Benneyan, the efficient secretary of the Amherst Chapter, writes that they have had two good meetings, at one of which Dr. Laidler spoke on "The Socialistic Challenge to the College Man," and the other was addressed by Gardner Harding on "Democracy in the Orient." The Chapter is preparing for a lecture on "India," by Lajpat Rai for April, and for May expects to secure Prof. Hamilton for a lecture on "Economic Problems.'

The work at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been mostly preparatory work for next year. Secretary F. S. Riggs writes: "On account of the many difficulties of holding meetings in the new building, it was impossible for the I. S. S. committee at the Institute to maintain a chapter. We hope," he continues, "to build up a large membership and an efficient organization as conditions become more satisfactory. Three meetings were

held and attracted the students. Senator La Fontaine spoke on "Internationalism," Dr. Laidler on "The High Cost of Living," and Gardner Harding on "Democracy in the Orient." The Walker Memorial Building for student activities will be completed for the next year's work, which will help very much.

MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES

One of the best attended lecture courses is reported by May Hoffman, secretary of the Barnard College Chapter. On October 21 Dr. Laidler spoke on "The Intercollegiate Socialist Society," November 1 Juliet Poyntz gave a "Survey of Socialism," December 6 Prof. Overstreet spoke on "The Ethical Aspect of Socialism," January 3 was given over to a report on the I. S. S. Convention by the student delegates. March 15 Prof. Montague, who attracted the largest audience, spoke on "Socialism, War and Preparedness." On March 21 Prof. Mason had as his theme, "Effect of Wealth on Music," and for April Dr. Jessie W. Hughan is on the program to speak on the "Duty of Socialists in the War Situation." The Chapter has also had an informal social evening and expects to hold another soon.

The Pennsylvania Chapter's first meeting was held, as reported by Secretary Calvin C. Cope, November 14, and was addressed by Dr. Laidler on "Organization." There were about 250 present and the result was the organization of the Chapter. Since then the meetings have been devoted to study. Spargo's "Elements of Socialism," Hillquit's "Socialism Summed Up," Hunter's "Violence and the Labor Movement," "Report of the Industrial Relations Commission," etc., have been the text-books used.

"The Adelphi Chapter," writes Rosalind Kohn, the secretary and treasurer, "has been holding its meetings every Monday during the noon hour since the beginning of this semester. This seems to be a more favorable hour and most of the students are able to attend. We are still studying "Facts of Socialism," and each week a member gives a summary of one or two chapters, after which general discussion follows. On March 12 Dr. Fradenburgh, of Adelphi College, delivered an address on "The Fallacy of Pacifism," which was followed by another on March 19 on "Pacifism," by Dr. Henry Mussey, of Columbia University. Both meetings were very largely attended.

Nancy Jackson, secretary of the I. S. S. Chapter at Cornell, reports three meetings, the organization meeting in October, addressed by Dr. Laidler, a lecture on "The Socialistic Functions of our Federal Government," by Prof. Bristow Adams in November, and on March 20, by Prof. Davenport, on "The Outcome of the War." Other probable speakers for future meetings are Professors Schmidt, Sill and Van Loom, Mr. Karapetoff and Mr. Hugins. The secretary adds: "We would like to have a speaker from New York City on May 1 to wake us up."

The Social Science Club, as the I. S. S. Chapter at the University of Pittsburgh is called, reports, through its secretary, Sophia Fengerat, that they did not have any speakers, but held regular meetings. The members decided to investigate the effect of the influx of colored workers from the South upon the city of Pittsburgh. Each member is spending a few hours every week in interviewing these emigrants and the results of this personal work form a very lively topic at the meetings. It is hoped that valuable results will be attained. The Chapter expects to hold some meetings with outside speakers shortly.

MIDDLE WEST

The Indiana University Chapter held a meeting on December 5 on Organization. On February 14 Rev. Irwin Tucker spoke on "Socialism, an American Ideal," to a good audience. On March 1 Mr. Mebane and Mr. Rawles led a discussion on "Utopian Socialism," and Dr. Laidler spoke on March 15 on "The Socialist Challenge to the College Bred." There is another meeting being planned, at which the subject will be, "Marx and the International." The Chapter has twenty-three members.

The Valparaiso University Chapter, with a membership of about forty-five, conducts a study class every Sunday afternoon. Morris and Bax's "Socialism, its Growth and Outcome," is used as a text-book. The members bring in reports upon the topics presented in the book, which lead to a general discussion. On October 27 a lecture by J. C. Kennedy brought together an audience of 160. On December 31 Ira Tilton spoke on "The War in Europe," which lecture was also well attended. Carl D. Thompson, secretary of the National Public Ownership League, spoke on "Christ and the Workingman" to about 175 of the students on January 6. On January 7 Prof. H. F. Black, of the University, spoke on "Martyrs of Truth in the Science of Astronomy." On January 20 Prof. L. F. Bennett, of the University, spoke on "Darwin and His Struggle for Truth." Other lectures were February 18th, "Education in a Democracy," by Prof. S. E. Shideler, of the University, and March 11 "The Development of Industrial Principles" by C. S. Hoover, also of the University, always to an increasing audience of the student body. On March 24 Dr. Laidler is to speak on "The Socialist Challenge to the College Bred," and on April 14 Prof. Scott Nearing on "Americanism." B. Steinhardt, the secretary, writes: "The Chapter is in great need of Socialist literature and periodicals. The only paper we succeeded in getting for the general library is the *American Socialist*. Last year we used to receive the *Call*, but this year they refused to send it, and the Chapter has no means to subscribe, since almost all the income goes for the rent of the meeting-place."

The Ann Arbor, Michigan, Chapter, is "going on fairly well, although there is of course room," as Shelby Ogden, the secretary, says, "for improvement. We have meetings bi-weekly, usually attended by thirty or more. Our greatest need is to get more non-Socialists in order to liven up the discussions a bit. On the 23d of last month Scott Nearing spoke to an audi-

ence of between three and four hundred and he seemed to charm his audience. We were, after quite a lot of argument and persuasion, able to secure a university building for him to speak in. We are sorry to say that the date of Mr. Spargo's arrival in the Middle West will make it impossible for us to schedule him, since our spring vacation extends from the 6th to the 16th of April."

David Weiss, of the Wisconsin Chapter, writes: "From a group of less than four active members of last year, the Wisconsin Chapter has grown to a membership of more than twenty-five. There is a keener interest and greater activity shown by the members this year than has been for the past three or four years. With a decline of radicalism in the University, which is due, it is said, to the reactionary stalwarts that now control the politics of Wisconsin,' the Socialist Study Club has received little encouragement from the University officials. In fact the Chapter has had considerable difficulty in securing a meeting room on the campus, and was compelled to meet at the Y. M. C. A. for the greater part of last year.

"Business meetings, which have always been considered 'dry' and uninteresting, especially to non-members, have been dispensed with. Instead, an executive committee of five members transact all the business of the Chapter and then present their report to the club of the action taken. This new method has proved successful and has eliminated much of the ordinary routine.

"Our program has been varied and covered many subjects. The first semester we studied the Rand School course in "Elements of Socialism." Each week a different member presented a thirty-minute talk on the lesson, which was always followed by an interesting discussion. Although we tried to limit our meetings to one hour, still many of them lasted longer than that period.

"On the completion of the Rand School study course we arranged a more popular program. Members of the faculty addressed the Chapter on the workers and their conditions in ancient society. Later, single tax, prohibition and anti-prohibition, social insurance, old age pensions, the church and Socialism and the capitalistic newspapers were taken up by different men and discussed before the club. This program seemed to be more popular with the students than the one we had during the first semeter.

"Outdoor meetings have been planned by the committee to commence after April 15. At these meetings it is planned to have one or two members arrange a fifteen-minute talk on some topic that the members are interested in. Needless to say that the social side of these hikes will not be overlooked.

"The officers are: Edward Deuss, president; Olaf Flood, secretary; executive committee, Miss Marie Gage, Miss Fannie Greenspan, Edward Deuss, Olaf Flood, David Weiss, chairman."

PACIFIC COAST

The State of Washington Chapter reports a membership of twenty. In Oct., Nov. and Dec. Mr. W. Thompson spoke on "Revolutionary Economics," Mr. Marius Hansome on "Methods of the Capitalist Press," and Prof. Cox on the "Downs and Outs in Literature." In March Miss Caroline Lowe, spoke on "Capital and Labor," and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn on the "I. W. W." Both addressed audiences of 500. On March 16 John Spargo addressed the general University Assembly on "Private Property Under Socialism." Ernest Leo is secretary.

Clara Eliot, secretary of Reed College Chapter, writes that the questionnaire on Socialism described in our October-November issue, brought in few definite statistical results, but stimulated thought. At the Dec. meeting C. H. Chapman spoke on "Fundamental Ideas of Socialism," in Jan., Victor McCone on the "Attitude of the Socialist." On March 15 John Spargo discussed "The International Situation," on March 19 W. F. Ogburn, Professor of Sociology, spoke on the "Future State," and M. P. Cushing on the Russian Revolution. An interesting discussion ensued on various phases of the war. In April C. E. S. Wood is to speak on "Anarchism vs. Socialism,' and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn on the "Everett Tragedy."

ALUMNI CHAPTERS

Washington, D. C., Chapter, Bennet Mead, secretary, writes that it is in good condition with a paid-up membership of twenty-three. No public meetings have been held this season A "get together" dinner is expected to come off in the near future.

Baltimore Alumni Chapter is holding regular meetings on the second and fourth Tuesdays of the month, each member conducting the study class in turn. They are using the I. S. S. Study Outline. There have been two meetings. In January Mr. John Spargo spoke and in December Rose Pastor Stokes addressed the Chapter and its friends. Katherine Lindsay is secretary.

Those wishing to buy Socialist and other books during the summer may order from the I. S. S. office.

FINANCIAL REPORT
1916-17

RECEIPTS

Dues	$1,226.50
Special contributions	8,577.62
Literature	305.49
Intercollegiate Socialist	193.68
Profits on meetings, etc	154.26
Miscellaneous	18.82
	$10,476.37
Balance from last year	255.58
	$10,731.95

EXPENDITURES

Rent	$600.00
Telephone	97.56
Printing	755.20
Postage, express and telegrams	633.34
Literature	209.60
Salaries	4,120.81
Organizers in field	2,111.48
Office supplies	203,30
Intercollegiate Socialist	910.39
Expenses of meetings, etc	302.06
Miscellaneous	97.97
	$10,041.71

Balance	$690.24
Donated and reserved for Middle Western Field.	665.79
Balance to 1917-18	$24.45

Mary R. Sanford,
Treasurer.

A CHOICE GROUP OF SOCIALIST BOOKS

Applied Socialism. By John Spargo. $1.25. The clearest and most logical statement yet written by an American Socialist regarding the probable working out of the co-operative system.

American Socialism of the Present Day. By Jessie W. Hughan, Ph.D. $1.25. A scholarly analysis of current views of American Socialists on practical and theoretical phases of Socialism.

Income. By Scott Nearing. $1.25. A fundamental criticism of the present system of industry. The present distribution of wealth is here graphically presented.

Fabian Essays. By Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, etc. $1.25. A brilliant series of essays dealing with the development of capitalism and the promise of Socialism, written from the viewpoint of the unorthodox Fabian Society schools of thought.

Socialism—A Promise or Menace? By Morris Hillquit and Dr. John A. Ryan. $1.50. An extraordinarily able debate on the *pros* and *cons* of Socialism by prominent protagonists of each point of view.

The Elements of Socialism. By John Spargo and Dr. Geo. L. B. Arner. $1.50. A college text-book on Socialism covering all phases of the movement in a systematic and scholarly fashion. The most comprehensive text-book yet written on the subject.

Syndicalism in France. By Dr. Louis Levine. 1.50 (paper), $2.00 (cloth). Generally considered the most scholarly and impartial presentation of the subject in English.

Progressivism and After. By William English Walling. $1.50. Gives an intensely interesting account of the collectivist developments in modern society and forecasts future tendencies. A real contribution to social thought.

Violence and the Labor Movement. By Robert Hunter. $1.50. A dramatic portrayal of the place of violence in the labor movement and of the long conflict between Socialism and Anarchism.

Socialism and Character. By Prof. Vida D. Scudder. $1.50. A finely reasoned attempt by a master English stylist to show the possible development of the ethical and spiritual in man under Socialism.

The Collectivist State in the Making. By Emil Davies. $2.00. The most comprehensive attempt thus far made to show the tendencies toward governmental activity in industry in the various countries of the world. A startling disclosure of the drift away from individualism toward collectivism.

Boycotts and the Labor Struggle. $2.00. By Dr. Harry W. Laidler. An analysis not only of the economic and legal aspects of boycotts, but also of the entire labor struggle in America, with its blacklists, "spy" systems, etc. The law of conspiracy in state and nation is elaborately set forth.

The Cry for Justice. An anthology of Social Protest. Edited by Upton Sinclair. $2.00. A remarkable collection of burning messages in prose and poetry that have kindled the fires of social protest throughout the ages.

History of Socialism. By Thomas Kirkup. Revised by Edward Pease. $2.00. The standard history of this movement from the days of Utopian Socialism to the outbreak of the European War.

Socialism: A Critical Analysis. By Prof. O. D. Skelton. $1.00. Probably the most scholarly attempt to refute Socialism thus far made.

The Socialism of To-day

Edited by

WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING, JESSIE W. HUGHAN, J. G. PHELPS STOKES
HARRY W. LAIDLER

PRICE, $1.60 (636 pp.)

Would you like to know the exact position of the International Socialist Party on the High Cost of Living? on Compulsory Arbitration? on Militarism? on Immigration? on the Farm and Land Problems? on the Trusts? on the Drink Question? on Co-operation? on Woman Suffrage? on Labor Unionism? on the General Strike? on Proportional Representation? on Unemployment? on Municipal and Federal Ownership? on Taxation? on Education?

The latest resolutions, speeches, debates, programs on these and other vital present day issues are fully set forth in "The Socialism of To-day."

Besides this the size, activities, problems of the Socialist and Labor parties in practically every country of importance in the world are described.

The first comprehensive source book on International Socialism is of thrilling interest and of increasing value to every student of the social problem.

Should be under the hand of whoever thinks or writes about Socialism. * * * There is no better summary of the movement as a whole.—New York *Times.*

There is evidence of scrupulous care to give every considerable variety of opinion within the Socialist ranks fair representation through a competent spokesman.—Springfield *Republican.*

FOR SALE AT

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

70 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

THE CO-OPERATIVE PRESS

General ∴ ∴ Book and Job Printers

15 SPRUCE STREET

Telephone.
BEEKMAN 3427

NEW YORK

I. S. S. PUBLICATIONS

"Municipal Ownership in the U. S.," (32 pp.) by *Evans Clark,* 1 for 10c.; 15 for $1.00. This is a comprehensive, impartial and scholarly survey of the extent of municipal ownership in this country—the first survey of its kind ever attempted.

"Cooperation in the United States," (32 pp.) by *Cheves West Perky,* 1 for 10c.; 15 for $1.00. (The first attempt to estimate the extent and significance of voluntary cooperation in the United States).

"Who Gets America's Wealth," and "New Income and Inheritance Taxes in the United States,' by *William English Walling,* (16 pp.) 1 for 5c.; 10 for 40c.

"To Skeptics and Doubters," by *W. J. Ghent,* (32 pp.) 1 for 5c.; 10 for 40c.

"The European War and Socialism," by *Harry W. Laidler.* (16 pp.), (1914) 1 for 5c.; 10 for 40c.

"Why Study Socialism?" Brilliant paragraphs, from more than 50 prominent writers and economists. (20 pp.) 1 for 5c.; 10 for 40c.

"What Socialists Stand For," (1 pg.) 2 for 1c.; 50 for 20c.; 100 for 35c.

"Socialism and the Student," (2 pp.) 1 for 1c.; 12 for 10c.; 50 for 35c.

"Study Courses," (16 pp.) 1 for 5c.; 10 for 30c.

"Book Lists," Free.

One of each of these pamphlets for 25c.